DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 148 SP 005 007

AUTHOR	Vogt, Thomas, Ed.
TITLE	Five Levels of Incompetence. Higher Education, Teaching, and the Education of Teachers. Report of the Grove Park Institute (June 10-15, 1969).
INSTITUTION	Consortium of Professional Associations.
PUB DATE	68
NOTE	265p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87
DESCRIPTORS	Anthropology, Economic Education, *Educational Improvement, Educational Innovation, Geography Instruction, History Instruction, Industrial Arts, *Institutional Role, Mathematics Education, Political Science, *Professional Associations, Psychology, Role Perception, Science Education, Second Languages, Sociology, *Teacher Education, *Teaching, Universities

ABSTRACT

This report contains nine papers presented at a conference on methods of improving teaching and teacher education and the role of the universities and professional societies in this effort. The speeches are divided into five sequential levels of "incompetence," denoting increasing involvement and experience with the problem. The report also includes the final recommendations and proposals for action by representatives of each of eleven professional societies. Associations represented in this section include: the American Anthropological Association, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Association of American Geographers, American Economic Association, American Historical Association, American Industrial Arts Association, American Psychological Association, American Political Science Association, American Sociological Association, Modern Language Association (English), and Modern Language Association (Foreign Languages). (RT)

ED052148

(1)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FIVE LEVELS OF INCOMPETENCE

HIGHER EDUCATION, TEACHING,
AND THE EDUCATION OF TEACHERS

THE GROVE PARK INSTITUTE

edited by

THOMAS VOGT

Consortium of Professional Associations
for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs

SP005007

1

ED052148

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. Prefatory Materials

Participants at the Oak Grove Institute............ i

Foreward: Executive Committee of CONPASS xix

B. Introduction and Conference Call

The Disciplines and Teacher Education: On The Relationship Between Recognizing Failure and Quality
Tom Vogt 1

A Challenge and Call To The Disciplines
Saul B. Cohen.......................... 3

I. The First Level of Incompetence: Intellectualism 11

The Disciplines In A Changing World
Bentley Glass.......................... 17

II. The Second Level of Incompetence: Inanition Before Complexity 33

Some Unsolved Problems in Economic Education
Kenneth E. Boulding.................... 37

The Experience in Foreign Languages
F. Andre Paquette 51

III. The Third Level of Incompetence: Action Without Thought 67

What Might Be Done Through Associations, University Structures, and Career Patterns to Increase Involvement of the Scholar
Paul F. Sharp.......................... 71

IV. The Fourth Level of Incompetence: The Fear of Hierarchy 83

Remarks Made at the Oak Grove Park Institute
John B. Davis, Jr. 87

We Already Have Our Hats
Vernon Haubrich 101

ED025140

V. The Fifth Level of Incompetence: Fear of the Past 117

Humanism, Society, and the Education of Teachers, Paul A. Olson 121

The Tribes of Yesteryear, Donald N. Bigelow 143

C. Struggles With Incompetence: Professional Society Discussions 151

i. American Anthropological Association 155

ii. AAAS Science and Mathematics 165

iii. Association of American Geographers 175

iv. American Economic Association 187

v. American Historical Association 199

vi. American Industrial Arts Association 211

vii. American Psychological Association 223

viii. American Political Science Association 233

ix. American Sociological Association 245

x. Modern Language Association (English) 255

xi. Modern Language Association (Foreign Languages) 267

xii. Among the Disciplines 277

xiii. Interdisciplinary Discussion 285

xiv. Interdisciplinary Discussion 289

xv. Interdisciplinary Group of Social Scientists and Historians 393

xvi. Resolutions Proposed and Passed 297

PARTICIPANTS

at the

GROVE PARK INSTITUTE

Alphabetical Listing

Listing by Association

The Grove Park Institute

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Abramson, Paul
Department of Political Science
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824
(APSA)

Alatis, James E.
Associate Dean
School of Language and Linguistics
Georgetown University
Washington, D. C. 20007
(MLA-ACTFL)

Anderson, Robert L.
Department of Psychology
Eastern Michigan University
Ipsilanti, Michigan 48197
(APA)

Angell, Robert C.
Sociological Sources for the
Social Sciences
503 First National Building
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48108
(ASA)

Bartholomew, Polly
Program Associate, CONPASS
400 A Street, S. E.
Washington, D. C. 20003

Baker, Earl
American Political Science
Association
1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
Staff

Benardo, Leo
Director, Foreign Languages
Board of Education
131 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201
(MLA-ACTFL)

Bernd, Daniel W.
Chief, TTT Branch
Bureau of Educational Personnel
Development
U. S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C. 20202
(USOE)

Bigelow, Donald W.
Director
Division of College Programs
Bureau of Educational Personnel
Development
U. S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C. 20202
(USOE)

Boneau, Alan
American Psychological
Association
1200 Seventeenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
(APA)

Borrowman, Merle L.
Department of Educational Policy
Studies
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
(AHA)

Boulding, Kenneth
Department of Economics
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado 80302
(Speaker)

Boyer, Mildred
Professor of Spanish and of Education
University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712
(MLA-ACTFL)

Brownsword, Alan
Acting Director
Division of School Programs
Bureau of Educational Personnel Development
U. S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C. 20202
(USOE)

Chapman, Kenneth
Assistant Education Secretary
American Chemical Society
1155 Sixteenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
(AAAS)

Cleland, Donald
Chairman, Reading and Language Arts
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213
(IRA)

Cohen, Saul
Dean of the Graduate School
Clark University
Worcester, Massachusetts 01610
(AAG)
Chairman, CONPASS

Crabb, David
Department of Anthropology
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
(AAA)

Cranz, F. Edward
Department of History
Connecticut College
New London, Connecticut 06320
(AHA)

Crockett, Walter H.
Speech, Communications and Human Relations
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas 66044
CONPASS Evaluator, ExTFP

Davis, John B. Jr.
Superintendent of Schools
807 Northeast Broadway
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413
(Speaker)

Decker, Howard S.
Executive Secretary
American Industrial Arts Association
1201 Sixteenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
(AIAA)

Delano, William
Gale Associates
1220 Sixteenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
(Individual)

Della-Piana, Gabriel
Bureau of Educational Research
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
(Evaluator, Tri-University)

Dershimer, Richard
Executive Director
American Educational Research Association
1126 Sixteenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
(AERA)

DiLavore, Philip
Department of Physics and Astronomy
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20740
(AAAS)

Doby, John T.
Department of Sociology
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia 30322
(ASA)

Dolan, Sister Mary Edward
Professor of Education and Psychology
Clarke College
1550 Clarke Drive
Dubuque, Iowa 52001
(IRA)

Douglas, Wallace
Department of English
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois 60201
(MLA-Eng.)

Farnen, Russell Jr.
Department of Political Science
George Peabody College
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
(APSA)

Fay, Leo
School of Education
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47405
(IRA)

Fleming, Theodore Jr.
Department of Political Science
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan 48202
(APSA)

Frankel, Moe L.
President
Joint Council on Economic Education
1212 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
(AEA)

Gaarder, A. Bruce
Chief, Basic Studies Branch
Division of College Programs
Bureau of Educational Personnel Development
U. S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C. 20202
(USOE)

Gearing, Fred
Director
Program in Anthropology and Education
1126 Sixteenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
(AAA)

Glass, Bentley
Academic Vice President
State University of New York at Stony Brook
Stony Brook, New York 11790
(Speaker)

Gonzalez, Nancie L.
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52240
(AAA)

Hall, Robert
3287 Oaks Drive
Hayward, California 94542
(DAVI)

Haley, Bernard
638 Salvatierra
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305
(AEA)

Hammond, James
President
State College at Fitchburg
Fitchburg, Massachusetts 01420
(AIAA)

Hardgrove, Clarence Ethel
Department of Mathematics
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois 60115
(AAAS)

Harper, Robert
Department of Geography
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742
(AAG)

Hartshorn, Merrill F.
Executive Secretary
National Council for the Social Studies
1201 Sixteenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
(Individual)

Haubrich, Vernon
University of Wisconsin
School of Education
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
(Speaker)

Hermanowicz, Henry
Dean, College of Education
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois 61761
(AACTE)

Hitchens, Howard Jr.
4509 G
U. S. Air Force Academy
Denver, Colorado 80840
(Staff)

Hite, Herbert
Department of Education
Western Washington State College
Bellingham, Washington 98235
(DAVI)

Hogan, Robert F.
Executive Secretary
National Council of Teachers of English
508 South 6th Street
Champaign, Illinois 61820
(MLA-Eng.)

Holden, Matthew
Department of Political Science
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan 48202
(APSA)

Hollingsworth, Alan
Chairman
Department of English
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824
(MLA-Eng.)

Hyer, Anna L.
Executive Secretary
Department of Audio Visual Instruction
National Education Association
1201 Sixteenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
(DAVI)

Kirkpatrick, Evron M.
Executive Director
American Political Science Association
1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
(APSA)

Kohn, Clyde
Department of Geography
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52240
(AAG)

Kormondy, Edward J.
Director
Commission on Undergraduate
Education in the Biological
Sciences
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
(AAAS)

Kranzberg, Melvin
Special Interdisciplinary Studies
Case Institute of Technology
Cleveland, Ohio 44106
(AIAA)

Laird, James D.
Department of Psychology
Clark University
Worcester, Massachusetts 01610
(CONPASS Evaluator, ExTFP)

Lassiter, Barbara B.
Babcock Foundation
Reynolda Village
Winston Salem, North Carolina
(Foundation) 27106

Leamon, M. Phillip
Chairman
Foreign Language Education
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
(MLA-ACTFL)

Lee, Addison E.
Science Education Center
University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712
(AAAS)

Lewis, Ben
Ford Foundation
320 East 4th
New York, New York 10022
(AEA)

Livermore, Arthur
American Association for the
Advancement of Science
1515 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W
Washington, D. C. 20005
(AAAS)

Lockette, Rutherford E.
Chairman
Department of Industrial
Education and Technology
Trenton State College
Trenton, New Jersey 08625
(AIAA)

Longaker, Richard
405 Hilgaard Avenue
Department of Political Science
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024
(APSA)

Lukerman, Fred
Department of Geography
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(AAG)

Mathews, Joseph J.
Department of History
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia 30322
(AHA)

Mayor, John R.
Director of Education
American Association for the
Advancement of Science
1515 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20005
(AAAS)

Mehlinger, Howard
High School Curriculum Project
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47401
(APSA)

Miller, James E. Jr.
Department of English
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois 60637
(MLA-Eng.)

Morrison, Sharon S.
813 Maryland Avenue, N. E.
Washington, D. C. 20002
(Staff)

Morton, Louis
Department of History
Dartmouth College
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755
(AHA)

Natoli, Salvatore
Association of American
  Geographers
1126 Sixteenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
(AAG)

Nystrom, J. Warren
Executive Secretary
Association of American
  Geographers
1126 Sixteenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
(AAG)

Olson, Delmar
Coordinator, Graduate Studies for
  Industrial Arts
Department of Industrial and
  Technical Education
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607
(AIAA)

Olson, Paul
Department of English
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
(MLA-Eng.)
(Speaker)

O'Malley, Mary
The Graduate School
Clark University
Worcester, Massachusetts 01610
(Staff)

Ott, Dorothy W.
Special Assistant, CONPASS
400 A Street, S. E.
Washington, D. C. 20003

Palaia, Joseph F.
Director, CONPASS
400 A Street, S. E.
Washington, D. C. 20003

Paquette, F. Andre
Executive Secretary
American Council of Teachers
  of Foreign Languages
Modern Language Association
62 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10011
(MLA-ACTFL)
(Speaker)

Pattison, William
Department of Geography
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Perloff, Evelyn
Department of Psychology
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana 47907
(CONPASS Evaluator, Project
  Impact Studies)

Phelps, Jewell
Dean of the Undergraduate School
George Peabody College
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
(AAG)

Pitts, Nathan
Division of Assessment and Coordination
Bureau of Educational Personnel Development
U. S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C. 20202
(USOE)

Ray, Willis E.
Co-Director
Industrial Arts Curriculum Project
The Ohio State University
1712 Neil Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210
(AIAA)

Reining, Conrad
Secretary
American Anthropological Association
1703 New Hampshire Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20009
(AAA)

Riley, Joyce
CIRCE
270 Education Building
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801
(Staff, TTT Evaluation, Phase II)

Ryan, Rebecca
400 A Street, S. E.
Washington, D. C. 20003
(Staff)

Ryan, Robert D.
Chairman
Department of Technology
St. Cloud State College
St. Cloud, Minnesota 56301
(AIAA)

Savelsberg, Inga
Modern Language Association
62 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10011
(Staff)

Schmieder, Allen
Deputy Director
Division of College Programs
Bureau of Educational Personnel Development
Washington, D. C. 20202
(USOE)

Seasholes, Bradbury
Chairman, Social Studies
Tufts University
Lincoln Filene Center
Medford, Massachusetts 02155
(APSA)

Semas, Philip W.
Chronicle of Higher Education
3301 North Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
(Individual)

Settle, James N.
Executive Associate
American Council of Learned Studies
345 East 46th Street
New York, New York 10017
(ACLS)

Sharp, Paul
President
Drake University
Des Moines, Iowa 50311
(Speaker)

Shugrue, Michael
Secretary for English
Modern Language Association
62 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10011
(MLA-Eng.)
(Chairman, Grove Park Institute Planning Committee)

Steffenson, James
Model Teacher Education Program
Bureau of Research
U. S. Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20202
(USOE)

Storey, Edward J.
Southeast Educational Laboratory
3450 International Boulevard
Atlanta, Georgia
(AAA)

Tagliacozzo, Daisy
Department of Sociology
Illinois Institute of Technology
Chicago, Illinois 60616
(ASA)

Tait, Gertrude
629 Noyes Street
Evanston, Illinois 60201
(Staff)

Teachworth, Judy
400 A Street, S. E.
Washington, D. C. 20003
(Staff)

Turner, Gordon L.
Vice President
American Council of Learned Societies
345 East 46th Street
New York, New York 10017
(ACLS)

VanderMeer, A. W.
Dean
College of Education
Pennsylvania State College
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802
(DAVI)

Varg, Paul A.
Dean
College of Arts and Letters
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823
(AHA)

Vogt, Thomas
7851 Scenic Drive
La Jolla, California 92037
(Editor, CONPASS)

Warburton, Minnie
1201 Sixteenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
(Staff)

Ward, Paul L.
Executive Secretary
American Historical Association
400 A Street, S. E.
Washington, D. C. 20003
(AHA)

Weber, Earl M.
Dean of Graduate Studies
Millersville State College
Millersville, Pennsylvania 17551
(AIAA)

Welsh, Arthur
Joint Council of Economic Education
1212 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
(AEA)

Wertheimer, Michael
Department of Psychology
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado 80304
(APA)

Wilde, Richard H.
Dean
School of Letters and Science
California State College at
Long Beach
Long Beach, California 90801
(AHA)

Williamson, Harold
Secretary-Treasurer
American Economic Association
629 Noyes Street
Evanston, Illinois 60201
(AEA)

Woodward, Robert L.
Consultant in Industrial Arts
Education
California State Department of
Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, California 95814
(AIAA)

Young, Albert T. Jr.
Executive Assistant to the Director
for Education
National Science Foundation
1800 G Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006
(NSF)

Young, Joseph
Executive Director
National Advisory Council on EPD
Room 308 Vanguard Building
111 20th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
(Individual)

Youtz, Byron L.
Vice President
SUNY Old Westbury
Box 540
Oyster Bay, New York 11771
(AAAS)

Zangrando, Joanna
400 A Street, S. E.
Washington, D. C. 20003
(Staff)

Zangrando, Robert L.
Assistant Executive Secretary
American Historical Association
400 A Street, S. E.
Washington, D. C. 20003
(AHA)

Participants in the Grove Park Institute

"THE DISCIPLINES IN THE CONTINUUM OF TEACHER EDUCATION"

June 10-15, 1969

I. ASSOCIATIONS

American Anthropological Association

David Crabb
Fred Gearing
Nancie Gonzalez
Conrad Reining
Edward Storey

American Association for the Advancement of Science

Kenneth Chapman
Philip DiLavore
Clarence Ethel Hardgrove
Edward Kormondy
Addison Lee
Arthur Livermore
John Mayor
Byron Youtz

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Henry Hermanowicz

American Economic Association

M. L. Frankel
Bernard Haley
Henry Villard
Arthur Welsh
Harold Williamson

American Education Research Association

Richard Dershimer

American Historical Association

Merle Borrowman
Edward Cranz
Joseph Mathews
Louis Morton
Paul Varg
Paul Ward
Richard Wilde
Robert Zangrando

American Industrial Arts Association

Howard Decker
James Hammond
Melvin Kranzberg
Rutherford Lockette
Delmar Olson
Willis Ray
Robert Ryan
Earl Weber
Robert Woodward

American Political Science Association

Paul Abramson
Russell Farnen
Theodore Fleming
Matthew Holden
Evron Kirkpatrick
Richard Longaker
Howard Mehlinger
Bradbury Seasholes

American Psychological Association

Robert Anderson
Alan Boneau
Michael Wertheimer

American Sociological Association

Robert Angell
John Doby
Daisy Tagliacozzo

Association of American Geographers

Saul Cohen
Robert Harper
Clyde Kohn
Fred Lukerman
Warren Nystrom
William Pattison
Jewell Phelps

Department of Audiovisual Instruction - National Education Association

Robert Hall
Herbert Hite
Anna Hyer
A. W. VanderMeer

International Reading Association

Donald Cleland
Sister May Edward Dolan
Leo Fay

Modern Language Association

English:
- Wallace Douglas
- Robert Hogen
- Alan Hollingsworth
- James Miller
- Paul Olson
- Michael Shugrue

Modern Language Association (Cont'd.)

Foreign Languages:
- James Alatis
- Leo Bernardo
- Mildred Boyer
- Phillip Leamon
- Andre Paquette

II. UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Daniel Bernd
Division of College Programs
Bureau of Educational Personnel Development

Donald Bigelow
Division of College Programs
Bureau of Educational Personnel Development

Alan Brownsword
Division of School Programs
Bureau of Educational Personnel Development

Bruce Gaarder
Division of College Programs
Bureau of Educational Personnel Development

Salvatore Natoli
Division of College Programs
Bureau of Educational Personnel Development

Nathan Pitts
Division of Assessment and Coordination
Bureau of Educational Personnel Development

Allen Schmieder
Division of College Programs
Bureau of Educational Personnel Development

James Steffensen
Model Teacher Education Program
Bureau of Research

III. SPEAKERS

Donald N. Bigelow
Director
Division of College Programs
Bureau of Educational Personnel Development
U. S. Office of Education

Kenneth Boulding
Professor of Economics
University of Colorado, Boulder

John B. Davis, Jr.
Superintendent of Schools
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Bentley Glass
Academic Vice President
State University of New York at Stony Brook

Vernon Haubrich
Professor of Education
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Paul Olson
Foundation Professor of English
Director, University of Nebraska Tri-University Project
Co-Director, Nebraska Curriculum Development Center

Andre Paquette
Executive Secretary
American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages

Paul F. Sharp
President
Drake University

IV. INDIVIDUALS

William Delano
Gale Associates

Merrill Hartshorn
National Council for the Social Studies

Barbara Lassiter
Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation Inc.

Ben Lewis
Ford Foundation

Philip Semas
Chronicle of Higher Education

James Settle
American Council of Learned Societies

Gordon Turner
American Council of Learned Societies

Thomas Vogt
CONPASS Editor

Albert T. Young, Jr.
National Science Foundation

Joseph Young
National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development

V. DIRECTORS AND STAFF OF CONPASS EVALUATION STUDIES

Walter H. Crockett, Co-Director
Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program Evaluation Study

Gabriel Della-Piana, Director
Tri-University Evaluation Study

James Laird, Co-Director
Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program Evaluation Study

V. DIRECTORS AND STAFF OF CONPASS EVALUATION STUDIES (Cont'd.)

Evelyn Perloff, Director
Project Impact Studies

Joyce Riley, Staff
TTT, Phase II, Evaluation Study

VI. STAFF (Central Office)

Joseph F. Palaia, Director
Polly Bartholomew
Dorothy Ott
Sharon Morrison

VII. RAPPORTEURS

Earl Baker
Howard Hitchens
Mary O'Malley
Rebecca Ryan
Inga Savelsberg
Gertrude Tait
Judy Teachworth
Minnie Warburton
Joanna Zangrando

FOREWARD

In October of 1968, the Board of the Consortium of Professional Associations for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs (CONPASS) decided that the time had come for it to move beyond evaluating other agencies' programs. It decided to call together leading members of fifteen national professional associations -- double the number of its members -- to consider what should be done about the role of the disciplines in the continuum of teacher education.

It took this step on the basis of two-and-a-half years' experience of active concern with coordinating evaluations of two programs -- the summer institutes and experienced teacher fellowship programs -- through which federal funds had been awakening higher education personnel into unprecendented activity to help school teachers strengthen their qualifications. All over our land individual college professors had learned they could help school teachers, and that this was a challengingly difficult job which needed to be done better. They did not want to stop trying, and CONPASS knew it.

CONPASS had itself been formed modestly, early in 1966 when five associations -- the Association of American Geographers, the American Historical Association, the Department of Audio Visual Instruction - NEA, the International Reading Association, and the Modern Language Association -- joined with two specialists in educational measurement and a representative of the American Council of Learned Societies, to submit a proposal to the Office of Education. All had been involved in evaluations of summer institutes, held the preceding summer, and were convinced of the importance of these programs. They were determined not to tolerate further duplication of efforts, and were persuaded that together they could and should raise standards significantly.

As initial consequence, studies were scheduled and completed on nine of the NDEA Titles XI and "Arts and Humanities" programs conducted in 1966. With expansion of the summer institute program to new fields, the Board of CONPASS was now enlarged to include the American Economic Association, the American Industrial Arts Association, and the American Political Science Association, with a new individual member from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Moreover, by the end of 1967 CONPASS's highly enlightening evaluations of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Programs had been launched, as well as its Project Impact

Studies, which for the first time confronted the real difficulties of probing the effects of summer-institute training systematically through before-and-after tests. Simultaneously, CONPASS had been providing consultant services for other projects like the Tri-University Evaluation, under USOE funding, and had given its group of executive secretaries and representatives a quite invaluable experience of the specific opportunities and difficulties to be faced in improving instruction in American schools.

This then was the basis for the decision in October 1968 to take a step toward basically new initiatives by convening, to quote chairman Saul Cohen's cautious words at the time, "several leading members" of appropriate societies "so that there will be a greater sense of involvement on the part of the disciplines." The result was the Institute at Grove Park, near Asheville, North Carolina, held June 10-15, 1969, which is described in the following pages.

What did this Institute contribute to the ongoing development which CONPASS exists to serve? At the present time of writing, one year later, a partial answer must include:

1. Twelve national professional associations have held working meetings devoted to designing projects to provide training for teachers, for various substantial parts of the continuum from elementary through graduate school.

2. Fourteen proposals have been developed and submitted (with funding assured by USOE) by thirteen different national professional associations for execution by colleges, universities, state and local educational agencies; business, labor, and governmental agencies, to the end of improving instruction in American education.

3. Major steps have been taken to begin coordinating such USOE programs as TTT, COP, Protocol Material Training Complexes, and Elementary Teacher Education Models, in the interests both of greater effectiveness per dollar spent, and of higher educational quality.

4. CONPASS itself has welcomed as additional regular members, the American Anthropological Association, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the American Educational Research Association, the American Psychological Association, and the American Sociological Association, with individual members from the American Association for the Advancement of Science in the person of its Director of Education, and from the National Council of Teachers of English in the person of its Executive Secretary. Prospects of cooperation among different

types of university scholars, for realistically improving instruction in the schools, have never before been as bright as now.

The associations owe a great debt of gratitude to the Office of Education for the cooperation over four-and-a-half years that has made possible the development of these genuine partnerships, deepening understandings, and envigorating efforts for better education.

Executive Committee, CONPASS

July, 1970

Introduction

THE DISCIPLINES AND TEACHER EDUCATION: ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RECOGNIZING FAILURE AND QUALITY

Tom Vogt
General Editor of the Conference Report

Teachers, like golfers, miss a humiliating percentage of their shots. Any superiority they gain on their tour comes to consist mainly in learning how to handle that chronic imperfection which is the first condition of their trade. They rarely rid themselves of it. When and if they do, they are forced to recognize in this very absence of strain and frustration their failure in self-criticism, a fundamental lowering of their standards. Their offenses against art, or scholarship, or research, are flagrant. Each of the disciplines imposes an ideal of the fully seen, or felt, or organized -- no essential part missing, no unintentional boinging, buzzing confusion.

To ask anyone to accept such contradictory assumptions beneath his labor is to expect much, and conceivably get little -- or even less. It is the source of the plea in the voice which opens the conference.

A CHALLENGE AND CALL TO THE DISCIPLINES

Saul B. Cohen

Chairman, CONPASS
Dean of the Graduate School
Director, School of Geography
Clark University

Presented at the
Grove Park Institute of the Consortium of Professional Associations
for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs
Asheville, North Carolina
June 10-15, 1969

A CHALLENGE AND CALL TO THE DISCIPLINES

It is with considerable pleasure that I welcome this assemblage on behalf of CONPASS -- the Consortium of Professional Associations for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs. To most of you hardened professional meeting-goers it is, I suspect, sheer delight to be at this lovely mountain retreat, seeing old frieds, having an opportunity to discuss serious matters in relaxed fashion, removed from the pressures of university "happenings" or from Washington budget-strained sessions. If physical environment does indeed relate directly to the decision-making process, if optimizing an environment can help us arrive at studied rational conclusions, then Asheville will prove to have been a fortunate choice and an historic meeting.

The purpose of this conference is to reassess the nature and extent of the commitment of scholarly disciplines to the teaching enterprise. To date, most of this commitment has been expressed through the actions of small, often isolated, numbers of individuals, operating within the confines of their scholarly disciplines. There has been little organized cross- or multi-disciplinary activity, at least at the initiative level of the national academic association.

To reassess our commitment we are going to have to think through a variety of educational, social and even political issues. We can no longer ask such narrow questions as: "How can professional historians see to it that better history is taught in the schools and colleges?" or "How can better-trained biologists be induced to enter teaching ranks, given adequate curricular materials?" For these are ego-centric questions. They fail to grapple with such central issues as the purpose of the educational enterprise, the relationship between the educational enterprise and society, and the specific responsibilities that professional scholardom has to the university in whose milieu scholardom either must thrive or languish. I would like to touch upon three aspects of this problem.

1) Our commitment cannot be made without a fundamental change in attitude towards the functional role of America's schools and colleges. We must ask ourselves what the functional role of educational institutions is and what it needs to be. For our attitudes towards students and teachers, our approach to curriculum, our understanding of the learning process hinge upon this question. It is time to recognize that most elementary, high school and even college students are not going to be professional economists, chemists or elementary teachers. And even if they were to become

so professionally-oriented, the role of the schools, especially the elementary and high schools, should be viewed as providing the educational milieu within which a student tastes the wide variety of career opportunities before making his choice. We should view the schools, above all, as diagnostic institutions. And we should view teachers in the schools, not as tenth or even second-rate professional scholars, but rather as intelligent diagnosticians, sensitive guides and responsible professionals. The implications of such a view are obvious. The trickle-down theory, whereby we as scholars cast distilled research pearls into the colleges and schools is not the answer. Nor is remoulding the hapless teacher in our own images through intensive training sessions, likely to yield desired results. Nor is the do-it-yourself, teacher-proof, instant curriculum pattern the path to salvation.

2) Our commitment cannot be changed without a direct response to the charge that the disciplines are not relevant. The problem of relevance is complicated. Surely, reading, writing and 'rithmetic is relevant to any society. Communication of some fashion, measurement of some fashion, a sense of perspective and of value of some fashion, an ability to formulate and solve problems in some fashion -- these are required both by those who want to accept the system in which we live and by those who would destroy, to replace it with some yet-to-be articulated system.

The issue of relevance -- or the charge of irrelevance -- can be viewed in several ways. First, it can be seen as an attack upon the political system, with those who are on the outside -- the poor, the ideologically disaffected -- using the charge indiscriminately. Second, it can be seen as part of the American trait of faddism -- society's interests, in dress, in automobiles, in mores; more particularly, it can be seen as the faddism in the American educational proclivity for changing directions. Thus, we shifted interest from language and area studies in the '40's and '50's, to science in the late '50's and early '60's, to psychology as an answer to personal problems within the context of the pressures of the nuclear age, to sociology in this period of need for group therapy in such matters as poverty and peace. Third, the heart of the matter, has to do with the process of continually increasing the numbers of students in schools and colleges, without the corresponding expansion of traditional career lines to accommodate these increasing numbers. The disciplines have served professional careers directly and have been the vehicle around which curriculum has been organized to serve this purpose, but the non-career bound student has been locked out of the process.

When we ask ourselves whether disciplines are relevant, we must consider that a variety of populations need to be served. For those who choose careers in biology, economics or history -- the disciplines undoubtedly continue to be relevant. But what of those who could have chosen these fields, but did not do so because of an initial negative impression of the field? And what of those who have no interest in any narrowly-defined field for professional reasons, but whose lives need to be touched by literature, by the sense of the historic, by an appreciation of economic principles, and who are simply turned off by how we in the disciplines present problems, develop materials and apply methodology? To be sure, disciplines should guard their methodologic approaches carefully, but we should put problem-orientation and problem-solving at the forefront of our efforts. By taking a leaf from some of the recent cross-disciplinary advances in science, including the emergence of new disciplines and fields out of common research experience, some of the current study apathy and discontent towards the Social Sciences and the Humanities might well be dispelled.

3) Our commitment cannot be made without a direct response to the challenge of the university crises, in recognition of the stake that we as disciplines have in resolution of the current crises. There is reason for optimism if we only have faith in our ability to respond to challenge. I am of the opinion that the current crisis in the university will, when it has passed, prove to have been good for the university and for the nation, for the crisis is challenging much that deserves challenge. It points to the need to shift the governance of the university from a narrowly-based authoritarian structure to a consensually-based community structure; and to the desirability of reorienting the university from research for war to research for peace. The crisis pinpoints the inadequacy of our current dependence upon traditionally discipline-framed methods of inquiry, and calls for approaches where focus upon problem-definition and problem-solving encourage a student to use discrete methodologies judiciously and interchangeably. The crisis warns us against the bimodal approach to racial problems that is either color-blind in its devotion to the goal of immediate integration, or color-over-reactive in its acceptance of the virtues of apartheid. Instead we should seek an approach that pursues integration as a long-term goal, providing short-term outlets for separatism for those who wish it, but in frameworks that are not allowed to destroy the mainstream of the system. The crisis confronts the university with the challenge to shift from its ivory tower perspective to an institution which has room to encourage both lofty and occasionally irrelevant contemplation and the application of socially relevant research and teaching. Finally, the crisis prods the university to face up to problems honestly, directly, and openly.

Good teaching is everyone's business in the university -- the classroom is no sanctuary for the whims of arbitrary instructors, or of irresponsible students. The dignity of the individual is everyone's business at the university -- faculty, administrators, but especially the student in the classroom -- whoever is affected should not suffer in silence. Fiscal responsibility is everyone's business at the university, not the exclusive burden of administration. Administrations that juggle operating cost figures or that inflate indirect cost structures; trustees that mismanage portfolios; students and faculty that refuse to make choices in establishing or curtailing programs are equally culpable. Structural change is everyone's business at the university. Adding substantially to the student population, expanding the physical plant, creating new divisions and schools, altering economic and social relationships to locality and region, these must be planned, justified and articulated. The institutional raison d'être is everyone's business at a university. Commitment to a certain kind of education, to a special style of training, to a unique mission of scholarship requires consistent review by all components of the university.

Examining the university crisis is an analysis of dissonance, for the university is no longer the social group that it was prior to the Second World War. Then cohesiveness stemmed from homogeneity and from loyalty to alma mater because alma mater represented and mirrored the system in which students wished to live. In contrast, the university of today has lost its cohesiveness: faculty identify with profession; students with a variety of socio-economic, real-world outlooks; administration with corporate images and philosophies; trustees with an ever-widening range of external responsibilities. And then, the dependent variable in these forces that have atomized the university, mobility, plays its uniquely American role. Can the university regain its cohesiveness? Yes, but hardly through restoration of the homogeneity of yester-year! Cohesiveness will be restored through heterogeneity, and the bonds of heterogeneity will lie in specific institutional educational strategies and philosophies, and in a governance structure in which responsibility for planning and implementing these objectives is consensually-based. Can we answer the question of how and where the disciplines fit in? We had better because the world expects it of us. In our assessment of the role of the disciplines in the fashioning and the refashioning of the curriculum, the forces that might well lead to substantial institutional structural change must be anticipated. A decade from now, much graduate training may take place outside the university -- in industry, in socio-economic agencies and in cultural institutions. And much of the in- and pre-service teacher training may well take place within the schools. The university must not remain the sole institutional domain of our scholarly associations.

The charge of this conference is in many ways vague and ambiguous. Let it be so. The letter that I wrote on December 9, 1968, set forth a number of propositions:

1) For various periods (four to ten years in most cases), many of the scholarly disciplines have been seeking to translate their content and spirit in a fashion that will have pedagogical worth to both schools and colleges. Various mechanisms -- summer institutes, year-round fellowship programs, curriculum packages -- have been utilized. CONPASS, and preceding the establishment of CONPASS, the individual disciplines, have been evaluating some of these mechanisms. It is time for the disciplines represented in CONPASS to review the results of these various evaluation studies.

2) CONPASS operates through its constituent organization. CONPASS' delegates have few opportunities to talk issues over frankly within their organizations. It is time for CONPASS' delegates to convene several leading members of their societies who are, or should be, concerned with the educational enterprise. What is needed is a greater sense of involvement on the part of the leadership of the disciplines.

3) CONPASS is concerned with more than merely evaluating existing models -- it should stimulate the creation of new models for teacher training in the separate and grouped disciplines. It is time to solicit ideas from a wide variety of individuals as to what kinds of new training models would be worth testing.

4) Last year's EPDA legislation and more recent decisions on budgetary allotments have raised some doubts in scholarly circles as to whether the USOE continues to be committed to encouraging teacher-training ventures in the disciplines. It is time to dispel doubts, about the commitment of USOE to encouraging teacher-training ventures in the disciplines, or to articulate the new position of USOE if there is indeed a philosophically different position that seeks to downgrade the role of the disciplines.

5) A considerable number of individuals and institutions who rallied to various NDEA projects seem to be backing away now. Is this simply "combat fatigue"? Is it disillusion with what has gone on? Or is it merely loss of momentum stemming from relaxation of efforts by the scholarly associations? It is time to inventory the involvement trends on the part of institutions and disciplines in the various USOE, NSF and foundation-supported teacher and curriculum development programs.

I urge you to consider the issues at two levels -- the disciplinary and the multi-disciplinary.

There are many who say that the disciplines are incapable of directing the necessary changes in American education. Perhaps they are right. But if they are right, then they are predicting chaos and doom. For without the traditions, the substance and the central role that disciplines must play in the educational enterprise, there will be no educational enterprise.

THE FIRST LEVEL OF INCOMPETENCE

Intellectualism

"I have to do only with Pure Research;
Therefore, I cannot go to the schools"

"I have bought a field,
And I must needs go out and see it.
I pray have me excused."

Luke 14:18

I

Dr. Laurence J. Peter and Raymond Hull, in The Peter Principle (Morrow), have proclaimed a discovery ("In a Hierarchy Every Employee Tends to Rise to His Level of Incompetence") which might well be extended. What is shown when the patterns which the disciplinarians perceive in the schools are applied to the attitudes of the disciplinarians themselves when they endeavor to "re-enter" the schools as teachers and trainers of teachers?

What is shown are levels of awareness of incompetency. At Grove Park five different classifications of "level of incompetence" emerge; they emerge from the speakers and discussants not in any order of rank or achievement, of past performance, or occupational bent. The distinctions are distinctions having to do with the ascending levels of incompetence through which people at the conference declare themselves willing to struggle.

The stages stand out clearest in the plenary session speeches -- not all by subject matter specialists, but all bearing upon the subject matter specialist's involvement with the schools, the degrees to which they are willing to involve themselves. These "stages" or "levels" separate from one another the disciplinarians in the discussion groups as well. The levels are clarified in the lobby, in the multiple dining rooms and halls, on the terrace, and in the "Bath and Tennis Club" fiction for "bar" in North Carolina. Some individuals switch from one level of engagement to the other during the week, sometimes in the course of one debate. Others may do so later. Newer and higher levels of incompetence will be found, if the conference is a success.

The first, and by far most comfortable level of incompetence may really be missing. Exclusive believers in pure research and scholarship, uncontaminated by any application -- not even the Trickle-down, but the Listen-if-you're-lucky, Theory -- are hard to find on the premises. The outright declaration that disciplinarians on the whole have no business in teacher education for the schools of this country is not made loud and clear, even by a devil's advocate: "Nobody will openly attack motherhood," Paul Olson says, adding quietly, "except mothers."

It has been one of the guidelines of the conference's composition. Should those who do announce, categorically, that the disciplines lose both themselves and their practitioners when lowered into the teacher training whirlpool be invited? Or should those who find many joint functions possible be helped to find more? The absolute position, "unyieldingly antagonistic", becomes the invitational boundary line.

As a result, no widespread urbanity about first up-grading the deplorable talent, and little light and distant scorn for the breed and mess beneath, is avowed at Grove Park.

This quota policy is attacked. "I told them I wouldn't come here," one speaker says, "unless they brought in a good group of these very guys we're trying to change. The few I've found so far keep looking back over their shoulders before they speak, like old fighter pilots."

The policy is defended. "We really need to see how many more of us there are than we thought, all over the place. We have to get ourselves together first."

To some extent, it works. A man who on Tuesday night seems perfectly relaxed on this first level sounds, a few days later, more likely to involve himself in some higher order of mistakes. He says he has been invited merely to round out the representation of his discipline. He has actually come only because of respect and friendship for its chairman, not for any dedication to his cause. He has attended and listened hard. His departing verdict has the same meticulously honest resignation. "We run into too many stone walls. The whole social and psychological atmosphere of the times is against such infiltration." But he has used the word "we".

Even long-standing divisions in learning theory -- the Deweyan critique of the subject matter approach, and the disciplines' shots at progressivism -- are muted now. Representatives of the schools of education themselves play down philosophical criticism of the liberal arts as a thing of the past: "A phony charge," one says. "We're both in the same bag. It's Kirkegaard they're having trouble with now, not Dewey. Just like us."

Remission of attack from such quarters explains much of the difficulty any disciplinarian has in saying flatly that he does not want to look at, or effectively care about, what is happening in American schools. He truly cannot, or does not have to, fall back on the practical difficulties involved: the threat to careers, the publishing that stops, the perishing that starts; or the acute distaste that some superintendents and supervisors form for the ineptness of scholars in do-gooder roles.

"I'm going back and ask my people to get themselves down there and look, for their plain own good," one representative from, not of, a professional association concludes (and he is careful to make the distinction). "I guess they're going to lose some of their subjects, if they don't. But after what I've heard here, who knows? Maybe they should?"

* * *

"No wonder Thomas Wolfe couldn't go back." A late arrival shakes his head, after coming through Asheville from the airport. "I wouldn't be able to, either. And I'm not even sensitive."

The civic blend of early nineteenth century red brick with late urban renewal bulldozer has opened too many skeletal walls and left too much mud in the streets for hills and trees to cover. But the actual choice of lodging, three miles away, has a certain inspiration.

The Grove Park Inn stands there looking back at the city, where it is known as "the rock pile", and at the Smoky Mountains, where its four floors of stone come from. Like the Mission Inn in Riverside, California, or the Taggart Hotel at French Lick, Indiana, it is a commercial derivative in the Hearst style of eccentric castle. Red tiles on the roof droop like bangs over the dormer windows. Slick red brick drives turn down every slope. In the huge lobby, over two fireplaces with andirons twisted by the resident giant, mottoes are stencilled in black and white on granite. Thomas Jefferson's "What pain hath cost us the evil that hath never happened" has people flipping through pages before they take a stand. The Grove Park Inn, designed without an architect, and built without a contractor (the claim of its own brochure), is the ideal place to keynote what the disciplines have done for the schools so far.

THE DISCIPLINES IN A CHANGING WORLD

Bentley Glass

Academic Vice-President
State University of New York
at Stony Brook

Presented at the
Grove Park Institute of the Consortium of Professional Associations
for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs
Asheville, North Carolina
June 10-15, 1969

THE DISCIPLINES IN A CHANGING WORLD

Through what must seem some inexplicable error of judgment, this audience of social scientists and humanists is asked to listen to a keynote address by a natural scientist. To explain that decision, I can say only that the natural scientists in the United States have for some years been deeply concerned about the teaching of the sciences in the elementary and secondary schools, have endeavored to develop new curricula through the work of nationally supported studies, and have, along with achievement of a measurable degree of success, committed many errors from which you may profit. I was the chairman of one such curriculum study. One matter is quite clear. Revision of what is to be taught in the schools must embrace the re-education and re-orientation in point of view of the teachers of each discipline. The new curricula are no better than the understanding of them by the teachers.

Teacher improvement programs are consequently the very essence of improvement in the teaching of a discipline. But it is equally true that you cannot expect teacher improvement without a thorough revision of the curriculum which takes into account man's growing knowledge and understanding, as well as the rapidly changing character of his physical and social environment. Teacher improvement programs and curriculum development must thus be considered together. In fact, the development of a new curriculum for teacher improvement is most likely the core of our educational need. Let me proceed to sketch briefly some of the broader considerations essential to an understanding of the educational problems of our times.

From the dawn of history, education has had two primary functions, one being that of transmitting from each generation to the next the knowledge requisite to human power and simultaneously of extending it, the other being that of enlarging the comprehension by man of his place in the universe. The first of these is the technical aspect of education; the second, the philosophical. Both are necessary. "Man must eat; but man cannot live by bread alone."

Neither of these aspects of education was at the beginning, in a true sense, liberal. The first was empirical. It grew slowly and painfully out of trial and error into arts and crafts, and ultimately into a scientific technology. The other began in magic, superstition, and primitive religion, and evolved in blood and tears into the cosmology of Copernicus and Galileo, the evolutionary theory of Darwin, and the psychology of Pavlov and Freud. Only in the last 350 years have these developments of human thought and education become fused in the growth of modern science. The functions of science in society thus parallel those of education. On the one hand, science is concerned with the development of increasingly adequate concepts about man and man's place in the universe. On the other hand, science has acquired the function of enlarging man's command over nature (including his own nature) by means of new knowledge acquired through systematic, accurate observation and controlled experimentation.

I have therefore on occasion claimed that science is in fact the greatest liberating and liberalizing force in human thought. It must, if this be true, be made an integral, central part of the liberal education. It is not peripheral to the education of modern man. It is crucial; the core within the apple, the skeleton within the human body; for it embodies the seeds of change and progress in civilization and it is the basis of support, giving form and shape to the social sciences, arts, and humanities of our time.

The problem is to integrate the teaching of the sciences with the rest of the liberal studies. As for the sciences, it is far more important how they are taught than how much time is devoted to them or what particular content is emphasized. The teaching of science in liberal education must above all else reveal its nature as an instrument whereby man approaches objective truth about the material world and the living beings that inhabit it. Scarcely second in importance is the need to reveal the social and humanistic relations of the sciences.

As for the social studies, the arts, and the humanities, it is equally necessary to transform their teaching so as to make clear their interdependence with the sciences. I dare assert that history is no history without some revelation of the role of the sciences and of technology in the ascent of man to his present state of power. The social sciences are no sciences without a grasp of the economic, political, and social problems that grow out of technological change based on scientific advances. Even art, as F. S. C. Northrup has said, has within itself no criterion of truth, but must rely for this on science and philosophy.

Every man, if he is to avoid confusion of spirit, must create for himself an integrated view of himself and his world. This is the function of philosophy and in carrying out that function it must work within the framework of scientific knowledge and concepts. We sadly need today a philosophy that will embrace the rights and the needs of the individual and also the welfare of society. At the same time, the new philosophy must be a dynamic one, changing with the basic shifts in man's scientific understanding of himself and his world, working toward a higher synthesis and not irrevocably tied to Newton or Einstein, Pavlov or Freud, Darwin or Mendel. We live in the hope to build of our conceptions a cathedral, vast and beautiful, time-tested, wherein the human spirit may find strength and courage, peace and wisdom.

For all of this, science has limitations as well as powers. It tells us much, but hardly everything. It can deal with matter and energy, space and form and time. It scarcely measures values; it is thwarted by intangibles. Science reveals truths, but perhaps never the whole of truth. Its grandest conceptual schemes and theories may fail and have to be replaced. It is objective, not subjective, while the inner life of man is, and must always remain, subjective. Science is the product of the human mind, but what the mind is we do not know.

What I have said makes clear, I hope, the interdependence of the sciences and the humanistic studies in the truly liberal education. It remains, of course, to discuss how these disciplines, however intertwined, should be taught.

No critique of education today should avoid the enormously rapid increase in the sum of human knowledge, and the consequent rapid social and cultural change which grows out of technological applications of scientific discoveries and which takes place within a fraction of the human life span.

The Exponential Increase of Science and Technology

A factor of overwhelming importance in education is the exponential growth of the natural sciences. In this century and in the more rapidly developing sciences, the fund of significant knowledge is doubling every ten to fifteen years. This conclusion would seem warranted by such facts as the following: first, that the profession composed of scientists and their technicians is, according to the United States census, the most rapidly growing of all professions and will very soon outstrip, if it has not already done so, every other single profession in absolute numbers, and, second, that the number of scientists now alive and publishing their research is greater by far than those of all previous times together. At this rate, the scientific knowledge available toward the end of a person's life will be about 100 times as great as at his life's beginning. A college graduate of 1940 who had a good grasp of the main ideas of biology, for example, will scarcely know half of those current in 1950 and a fourth of those regarded as important in 1960, even if he has forgotten nothing of what he once learned. The flood of recorded knowledge embodied in 20,000 biological journals publishing close to half a million original researches annually is like that from a bursting dam. The ablest biologists struggle in vain to cope with it.

The biology textbook is today out-of-date and in need of serious revision in a span of five years. The knowledge of a biology teacher undergoes a similar obsolescence. Unless he keeps learning at a pace that demands ever greater effort, his stock in trade depreciates at about the same rate as an automobile -- in five to eight years; unless replenished and renewed, it is practically worthless. Thus, the greatest challenge which education must face in our time is that of coping with the rapidity of change in science, in technology, in human power, in the conditions of man's life. The crux of modern education lies precisely here: that the educated man of yesterday is the maladjusted, uneducated man of today and the culturally illiterate misfit of tomorrow. Education must clearly become a continuing process of renewal.

The obsolescence of education differs only in degree in the several sciences, and even in the humanities. Physicians continue to practice medicine although fifty years have elapsed since their youthful preparation. Dentists do the same. Lawyers and engineers live comfortably on their antiquated stock in trade. Teachers slide steadily downhill in their grasp of new developments in their own subjects. What is perhaps worse than any of these is the virtually universal ignorance, on the part of educated men and women, of any advancement of knowledge outside their own professional specialities. Surely, we need a complete and thoroughgoing change in attitude toward "adult education", a careful planning of appropriate programs and courses designed for the intelligent adult who has grown out of touch with his new world, and a mandatory, cyclic renewal of training for the professional specialist.

The cry of the student throughout the land is for "relevance" in the curriculum. What does he mean? Change has become the major feature of human civilization, driven by an increasingly rapid development of enormous powers to modify and control raw nature; and the advance of science is the principal factor in this technological revolution. Education must prepare each person to cope with changes that are unpredictable, but the content of the curriculum should, of course, embrace the timeless as well as the timely, for topical and social relevance and timeless natural law alike deepen our perspective and assist us to adapt ourselves to altered circumstances.

THE TEACHING OF THE DISCIPLINES

How should the teaching of the social sciences and humanities be related to the world of rapid change in which we live -- the world of new and overwhelming social and political problems, of rapid technological developments, of shaken and failing ethical, religious, and philosophical guidelines? My own experience being related to the teaching of the natural sciences, and especially to biology, rather than the social disciplines, what I have to say about that experience may not be very applicable to your own concern. Nevertheless, I think some of our experiences in the development of the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study (BSCS) and in teacher improvement may offer a model which your own program can use as a point of departure.

Begun in 1959, with the generous support of the National Science Foundation, the BSCS, from the very first, determined to involve in equal measure the efforts of both professional biologists from the colleges and universities and of secondary school biology teachers, in approximately equal numbers. The former would provide the knowledge of specialists working at the frontier of the discipline who could say what is currently important and significant and how the conceptual structure of the science has evolved; the latter would provide the equally necessary practical knowledge of pupil comprehension, motivation, and interest, and thus of teaching strategy. Such success as has been achieved in securing the adoption of the BSCS program in the American high school is largely attributable to this dual composition of the working teams, which permitted the teachers to feel that in a real sense the BSCS was their own program, and not one foisted upon them by educators or scientists remote from the educational crucible.

A second working policy of great importance to our ultimate success was the resolution not to be content to draw up tables of objectives and guidelines, like so many conferences and committees in the past, but instead to set earnestly to work to prepare materials which could actually be used in the classroom and laboratory by selected teachers, and thereafter, be revised and improved on the basis of criticisms supplied both by scientists and by practicing teachers.

I distinguish four cardinal objectives of the BSCS. The first imperative was to update the antiquated content of the biology courses in the high schools. In large measure the failure to modernize the curriculum has resulted from the extraordinary increase in scientific knowledge in our century. Biology is a particularly rapidly developing area of science. Biology in the high schools was even more seriously antiquated than chemistry or physics. It had never received quite the administrative sanction of the physical sciences and was quite generally taught without laboratory facilities. That the biological sciences had in the past fifty years moved away from the purely observational, descriptive aspects of science to a truly experimental status was not recognized in the schools. In the 1950's the content of the textbooks and courses differed in no evident respect from what it had been in the 1920's. The principles and laws, the concepts and conceptual schemes which were treated were archaic.

Other great ideas had never been admitted at all. The great theme of organic evolution, which is central to the organization and interpretation of biology, and which has become vastly developed in the past forty years beyond the simple Darwinian schema, was generally left unmentioned. One must realize the centrality of evolution in the biological sciences to appreciate the consequences. One must understand that modern genetics makes no sense without it, the relation of organism to environment makes no sense without it, regulation and adaptation of form and function make no sense without it. The theory of evolution is not only the key to the understanding of the past of life on earth,- it is the key to the understanding of the socially critical phenomenon of race, and it is the key to man's future. Man now grasps the power to mold his own species, as well as all others, according to design. This power grows from an understanding of genetic and evolutionary principles. It poses serious social and ethical problems. Are we a second time to blunder into an age of frightful unforeseen powers without knowledge? Is it not still true that "without vision the people perish"?

Also omitted were the subjects of human sexual reproduction; race; molecular biology, born of the fusion of genetics and biochemistry; and environmental biology, the newly recognized science of populations and communities.

The second major tenet of BSCS thinking was opposition to an authoritarian approach to the teaching of science. Much violence is done in the schoolroom to the true spirit and nature of science because of the textbook writer's implicit assumption of omniscience and infallibility, and the teacher's inclination to adopt an analogous attitude. As I have said elsewhere:

> To understand science one must see a problem unfold from its beginnings, see progress impeded by traditional ways of thought, learn that scientists make mistakes as well as achieve successes, and observe what experiments brought illumination, and why. One must ask continually, 'What is the evidence?' One must observe how frequently the truth of today is a synthesis of opposing counterviews and countertheories held in their time to be irreconcilable. And one must learn from the study of cases how varied and refractory to definition are the methods of science. As to its spirit, there is little of that in either the conventional textbook or lecture. One meets it better in Arrowsmith or the Life of Pasteur. It is born by contagion; its home is the laboratory, the observatory, or the field, wherever the inexperienced person can observe experience, and the novitiate partake of the zest of discovery.

The third cardinal principle guiding the BSCS was to encourage the teaching of science as a process of investigation and inquiry, and not simply and wholly as a body of knowledge, organized into concepts and conceptual schemes. The so-called "laboratory workbooks" we examined were a travesty in every sense, requiring the student to answer questions about the names of structures observed and their presumed functions, or to look them up in the textbook. We proposed, however difficult it might be, to substitute genuine experimental work involving real unknowns. We would lead the student to acquire certain fundamental skills only in order that he might then pursue a line of investigation into a truly independent, "open-ended" inquiry. To us it mattered less whether the student "covered" prescribed areas of study than whether he probed sufficiently into one area to grasp the nature of its unsolved questions and the methods of scientifically resolving them.

The fourth of our working principles was a recognition that certain unifying themes should be used, not so much to form the subject of a particular section of a book or course, as to constitute the warp binding the fabric of biology into a whole. The unifying themes were to appear in every chapter, underlie every discussion and auxiliary activity, and permeate the thought of writers, teachers, and students, whatever the organisms with which they might be dealing, whatever the level of organization, from molecule to biome, to which attention might be directed. This aim proved most difficult of all to carry out, but in the end most rewarding. Seven great biological themes were selected: evolution; diversity of type combined with unity of pattern; genetic continuity; the complementarity of organism and environment; the biological roots of behavior; the complementarity of structure and function; and regulation and homeostasis. To these we added two themes applicable to all science, but taken here in their biological context: biological science as a process of investigation and inquiry; and the history of the great biological concepts and schema. Many teachers and students have told me that for the first time the organization of facts and ideas around these great themes produced a sense of unity and coherence in the teaching and study of biology that had hitherto been lacking.

A recent re-examination of our BSCS program convinces us that these four cardinal objectives are sound, but that a fifth one ought to be added, namely, an emphasis upon the social context of the science. It is not simply that biological discoveries have changed man's ways of living and of regarding himself in the universe, or that in the future they will serve to make a "brave new world". More fundamental, and more disturbing, is recognition of the fact that man is in imminent danger of so defiling and destroying his natural environment that he cannot survive within it. Evidence that students, in seeking for "relevance" in their courses of study, have great concern about these matters is to be seen from an experience of this past year at the State University of New York at Stony Brook. We initiated a series of University Lectures dealing with the relations of the natural sciences to other disciplines and with crucial problems in the future. The lectures, once a week, were given by local faculty members as well as distinguished visitors, and were open to the entire community without registration or fee. Those students, either undergraduate students or graduate students in continuing education, who might wish to probe more deeply and obtain credit toward a degree, could enroll in seminars based on the lectures and requiring advance reading on each topic, group discussions, and term papers. The course proved very popular. There was an average attendance of about 400, two-thirds of whom enrolled in the seminars for intensive study and credit.

Both in the BSCS development of a novel biology curriculum and in the "Science and Culture: Future of Man" course a major difficulty has been to secure enough broadly trained persons to engage in writing and testing, or in leading seminars on a great diversity of subject matter. Francis Bacon, in the Advancement of Learning, speaks instructively of two distinct kinds of scientists, the pioneers, who dig, and the smiths, who refine and hammer. It seems evident that we have done rather well, in our American graduate education, to produce an abundance of pioneers, but we sorely lack smiths, who can construct for us great unifying theories like those produced in the nineteenth century. The increasing narrowness of specialization forced upon us by the enlargement of knowledge and the exclusive bestowal of rewards (prizes, promotions in rank and salary, recognition and fame) upon the pioneers reduces the prospect that the techniques and concepts of quite different fields can be brought together in a fresh and original synthesis marked by insight and imagination. Too many scientists have blinders over their eyes, and can see only straight ahead! What excellent diggers they are! But where are the smiths, who must refine and hammer, create alloys, and fashion a meaningful new whole for the younger generation?

Teacher Improvement Programs

What can be done? I believe that the Japanese have pointed the way. During a visit of several weeks in the summer of 1965, I was privileged to observe the work of six of their Science Education Centers, of which there are now more than thirty, located in every prefecture and major city of the country. The first of these Centers was founded only nine years ago, largely through local initiative in various school districts -- remarkable in a country with such a strong central Ministry of Education. In these districts, far-sighted educational leaders had realized that drastic and novel steps had to be taken to reduce the obsolescence of the trained science teachers in the schools. The organization of a typical Science Education Center is well worth describing. In a building, erected as a part of the school system by the local Board of Education, one usually finds four laboratories accommodating classes of about 24 students for physics, chemistry, biology, and earth sciences, respectively. Adjacent to each laboratory is a large room of similar size for the staff of each department and for storage of equipment, preparation of materials, and so forth. In addition, each building is likely to contain a modest library, perhaps a lecture room for up to 100 persons, offices for the administration, and in some cases a dining hall and dormitory rooms for the teachers in residence. Besides equipment very like that of a typical Japanese high school, the Center may have collections of minerals and fossils, a greenhouse, a small animal collection and pieces of expensive equipment such as a donated electron microscope, an X-ray machine, or a 15 cm-telescope, which the teachers can learn to use and demonstrate and to which they can later bring their own classes for study and observation.

The most remarkable aspect of the Centers, however, lies in their staffing and programming. Each Center has a permanent staff, generally composed of a scientist and one or more highly experienced high school teachers for each discipline. These staff members plan and prepare, as well as teach, the courses of the Center. There are two kinds of courses, for the most part. Short courses, five days long, are given in intensive fashion, utilizing the best of new materials and methods. I was surprised to find that the staff members were very well acquainted with our American science curriculum studies and were making full and effective, indeed very critical, use of them. The majority of teachers in the local school system, embracing often upwards of sixty schools, are thus provided with effective stimulation and renewal of training. Because teachers in Japan are employed on a twelve-month annual basis, they are subject to duty the year round, and the Science Education Centers are never empty. During the school term, to the maximum extent possible, teachers are released from regular duties to attend the week-long course while their places are taken by substitutes or other arrangements are made for the students by flexible scheduling. The second type of course is one of great scope, occupying a group of 25 teachers a full half year on leave from teaching duties. The depth of training possible in a course that runs all day, five days a week for a half year is indeed excellent, and explains the fact that I saw in Japan the best demonstration teaching with high school students I have ever been fortunate enough to observe. The product of such courses is a group of master teachers who are dispersed to different schools and who effectively revitalize there the teaching in their subjects.

The effects of this relatively recent educational experiment were so dramatic that within a year or so the Ministry of Education stepped in to support the operating budgets of the Centers to about one-third their cost, and to aid in the development of new Centers. By 1965 the results were so extraordinary that it was decided without further trial to extend the Centers to include mathematics, social studies, language, and other disciplines.

In the United States, where local and State Boards of Education are so fearful of federal interference and domination, the pattern established by the Japanese Education Centers offers particular encouragement. Why cannot our universities, which have until now so timorously ventured into the vital task of continuing education, now cooperate with local school systems to establish regional education centers that are more than hotels or conference centers -- that instead answer this most serious challenge to our entire social fabric? Federal assistance is very well, but it is amply evident that our summer institutes, even though now in existence for more than a decade, skim off only the cream of the teaching profession, and leave the majority of teachers unaided -- in fact, more obsolete in knowledge of their subjects and of improved ways of teaching with every passing year. An even more serious indictment of the summer institutes and of continuing education programs is that, with the rarest exceptions, no serious continuous thought and effort have been given to the design of courses really suited to the needs of the teacher afflicted by the obsolescence of his preservice training. It is self-evident that the kind of course well suited for a freshman or sophomore college student is not at all suitable for a teacher of the subject, with much former study of the subject but now in need of review and freshening and especially of adequate explanation of significant new developments and their relationships to the older materials. Nor is the usual course designed for a junior or senior college student, much less for a graduate student, at all useful for a renewal of training and an extension of knowledge.

The Teaching of the Social Sciences and Humanities

I now venture into a field quite beyond my personal experience. Yet a few generalizations drawn from the teaching of the natural sciences may be of some use. I am encouraged to think so by the example of Carl Becker, who in three short essays under the title Progress and Power in 1935 eloquently and persuasively united the biological, evolutionary view of man with the historian's view of his progress in civilization. Education transmits from past generations to each new generation of mankind the sum of knowledge which gives man his power, the increase of which Becker defines as "progress". Education is therefore a conservative force, preserving, storing, transmitting knowledge. Yet the very accumulation of knowledge requires that education be also selective, sorting out the timely and the timeless from the trivial. The more rapid the pace of change, the more necessary and drastic the requirement for selectivity, reorganization, and creative synthesis in the development of the curriculum.

In his striving for command of a particular subject, in his search for hidden facts that may illuminate his interpretation, the scholar may perforce restrict his field of specialty to less and less. The teacher must, on the contrary, seek through greater breadth to cast light upon the relationships of phenomena which conventionally are assigned to different fields of study. He braves the charge of superficiality in the knowledge that new and important disciplines always emerge from the borders between the older disciplines, from an application of the concepts and techniques of one to the phenomena of the other. How to cultivate this breadth without real superficiality is the problem we must face in the improvement of teacher training and retraining. From personal experience I would say you must first find a man gifted with the desire to master many fields and to explore the relations between them. Him you surround with a team representing specialists of appropriate sorts. The team must then work intensively to produce actual educational materials for trial in the schools and colleges. In the effort to work out their ideas, all will grow in breadth and depth together.

Man is an evolving species, but the rate of biological evolution is very slow. It seems doubtful that any change in his mental capacities has taken place since Cro-Magnon times, or perhaps even in the past hundred thousand years. Humanly directed evolution may accelerate that rate of evolution although there is likely to be great opposition to the artificial control of human breeding. In any case, the great progress in civilization made by man until now has been possible on the basis of his original mental endowment, and there is no reason to suppose that social evolution cannot continue indefinitely. As Rene Dubos has so clearly shown in his book, Man Adapting, the adaptability of man both physiologically and psychologically is very great. Even so, can man, if seeing clearly that present social evolution based on technology will sooner or later provide disastrous modifications of his natural environment, voluntarily desist when there is present, personal profit? Garrett Hardin, in an essay entitled "The Tragedy of the Common", has pointed out how unlikely that will be.

Wisdom might be defined as the far-sighted exercise of human power. The definition implies both self-restraint and foreknowledge of consequences. Education must supply these in sufficient measure; therefore, we must begin with an appropriate program of teacher education. It must be aimed at the existing cadre of teachers as well as the future teachers. It must aid all of them, not just the cream of the profession. The urgency is extreme. In a few more decades it will probably be too late to avoid catastrophe.

In a recent article I outlined a six-point educational program for the scientific needs of developing countries -- and what nation would' not like to regard itself as still developing? These points can be generalized, I believe, to cover all educational disciplines. The paramount needs are the following:

1. To provide a good curriculum for training teachers for the local educational system;

2. To provide adequately for training sufficient numbers of teachers;

3. To provide education centers to retrain teachers continuously as a regular part of their annual duty;

4. To send a sufficient number of the best students abroad to engage in advanced study;

5. To supply posts and research facilities in sufficient number and of sufficient attraction to bring most of these students home after training abroad;

6. To establish an agency, or several, to make a continuous study of the relevance of new scientific discoveries to social and economic and health needs in the particular country and culture.

The six points form a system, the last being essential to success of all the others, for the task outlined there is no less than to coordinate the preceding measures with the changing order of the world and especially with the economic pressures and social ferment of the home country. For this purpose agencies which will examine as fully as possible the long-range effects, and the side-effects, of new technological developments upon the local environment and structure of society will be indispensable.

Man is a social animal in a complex environment. At his peril he ignores the balance between density of population and its mode of life, on the one hand, and the resources of the environment, inanimate and living, on the other. Nature's cycles are mighty but often delicately subject to overthrow. Civilizations before now have destroyed themselves through waste of their soil or through passive encouragement of seedbeds of disease. It can indeed happen again, through ignorance or folly. The nation that is wise will therefore study closely all trends in other nations, and avoid their mistakes.

The ideal is a people adjusted to its land and its resources, and daily increasing its richness of life through the applications of science and technology to its needs.

The proposed national agency is, then, needed to relate the factors of change inherent in scientific discovery and education to the whole system of a people living in its homeland, and to plan intelligently for its future well-being.

THE SECOND LEVEL OF INCOMPETENCE

Inanition Before Complexity

"We are but Helpless Pieces in the Games the Schools Play,
Upon the Black and White of Children's Nights and Days?"

"All that man is
All mere complexities
The fury and the mire of human veins."

Yeats

II

It is the second level which has the largest and most eclectic representation; the level where the necessity of the disciplines to examine and re-interpret their use in the schools is absolutely insisted upon, and insisted upon in a sufficient variety of forms to preclude much movement.

Not all forms of the insistence are even psychologically useful. The awareness sometimes subsides into self-congratulation; self-congratulation often made through giving warning against the tendency to congratulate oneself. At one edge of this level a highly professional brand of conference-manship is also practiced. The leading exemplar is the man who comes here to report on another conference, of tangential reference to this. He goes on in detail, at length. How did it all come out? Oh, he really doesn't know. He had to leave early. He leaves here early, too. Perhaps to report on the conference.

At the other edge of this level, a kind of terminal satisfaction sits back after handing down a suitable set of materials for the various grades; it waits upon others to do the same before any general advance can be made. "A tendency to float above it all," as one critic says. "Like barrage balloons, on longer and longer cables. These fellows feel attached. But they're really only hovering."

On the other hand, this level is the intellectual center of the disciplines' attempt to re-orient themselves toward the schools. Its learning and wit are self-deprecatory, informed and felicitous at the same time ("what the psychologist calls frustration, the economist calls equilibrium").

This is the level where tragedy and the complexity of man's affairs are most skillfully expounded. The unrefinable residue of pain and loss. The intractable nature of reality. The slippery truths which elude denomination. It is that level of incompetence in concern for the schools where people in the disciplines enjoy themselves the most. Brilliant capacities are brought into play. Trained talents not usually turned in this direction explore the novelty of their choice. Age-old problems are broken down into new divisions of insights.

SOME UNSOLVED PROBLEMS IN ECONOMIC EDUCATION

Kenneth E. Boulding

Professor of Economics
University of Colorado

Presented at the
Grove Park Institute of the Consortium of Professional Associations
for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs
Asheville, North Carolina
June 10-15, 1969

SOME UNSOLVED PROBLEMS IN ECONOMIC EDUCATION

Whatever complaints we may have to make about economic education we cannot complain that it is neglected. Twenty years ago, indeed, this complaint would have been justified, but in these two decades a great deal of energy and enthusiasm has gone into it and even a small amount of money. It is impossible in this short space and at this short notice to do a complete survey of what has been going on. This badly needs to be done. Any list of achievements in this field would have to begin with the work of the Joint Council on Economic Education in New York, under the leadership for the last fifteen years of Dr. M. L. Frankel. In giving a feeling for what has happened in the last twenty years, I can hardly do better than quote Dr. Frankel himself:[1]

> In 1950 less than 5% of our secondary school students were receiving any formal course work in economics. Today well over 30% of our high school seniors are enrolled in economics courses and this figure is moving upward.
>
> Few economists concerned themselves with economic education. Most educators regarded economics as an esoteric discipline relegated to the high priests of the profession. Today the Joint Council's program enjoys the full support of the American Economic Association.
>
> Only three states had any requirements in economics for teacher certification. Today that figure stands at 28.
>
> In 1948 there was one summer institute in economic education. This summer the Joint Council is co-sponsoring 52 institutes.

---

[1] M. L. Frankel, "Economic Education: 1967," an address presented at the Annual Conference of the Ohio Council on Economic Education, Neil House, Columbus, Ohio, May 15, 1967. Athens, Ohio: Ohio Council on Economic Education, College of Business Administration, Ohio University, 1967, p. 4. Figures revised to 1969 by Dr. Frankel in a personal communication.

In 1949 there were no Centers for Economic Education. Today there are 55.

Research in economic education was virtually nonexistent. Today we have a card file of over 1500 citations of research studies, articles, and books in the field.

In 1949 few schoolmen were concerned about economic education. Today their demands for assistance are far beyond our ability to satisfy.

Dr. Frankel would be the first one to deny that all this activity had been the result of the Joint Council's work alone. Nevertheless, the existence of an active organization in the field exercising persistent pressure towards the expansion of economic education has an effect which is hard to overestimate.

From the standpoint of the economics profession itself, there has been a similar persistent pressure in the shape of the Committee on Economic Education of the American Economic Association, headed by Dr. G. Lee Bach. The importance of Bach's work in again exercising persistent pressure year after year arranging meetings at the annual meeting of the American Economic Association, working with the Joint Council, and constantly stimulating serious research in problems of teaching economics can hardly be overestimated. More than anyone else in the profession, Bach has made economic education "respectable." The Bach committee has operated mainly at the level of college teaching in economics, and in that sense has supplemented the work of the Joint Council, which has concentrated on the elementary and high school level.

Again, the values of persistent pressure and organization are seen in the work of the Social Science Education Consortium, headed by Dr. Irving Morrissett at the University of Colorado. In economics, the work of Dr. Lawrence Senesh is closely associated with the Consortium and represents still another facet of activity, this time concentrated mainly in the lower grades, from kindergarten up. Dr. Senesh has demonstrated that economics can be taken seriously even in the kindergarten and that furthermore the intellectual effort involved in getting meaningful economic concepts into the curriculum of the lower grades is of first-rate importance for the economics profession itself. I have invented something which, without Dr. Senesh's permission, I have been calling "Senesh's Law" -- that if you can't teach it to the second grade, it probably isn't true. I am prepared to admit some exceptions to this law, but when one sees what extraordinary quantities of artificial, unnecessary or even harmful knowledge are propagated in graduate schools, the task implied in sifting out the basic essence of what economists think they know for transmission to children is an intellectual challenge of first magnitude.

The moment of takeoff in any field clearly arrives when it receives the serious attention of commercial publishers and this moment has arrived without any doubt in the field of economic education. It is almost invidious indeed to pick out specific offerings, but I can hardly forbear mentioning the materials of Dr. Senesh himself for the lower grades, which have a charm and sparkle all their own, but do seem to require teachers above the average.

One must mention also the Holt Social Studies Curriculum, edited by Edwin Fenton, of which the one in Comparative Economic Systems is particularly exciting to the economist. One must mention also the exciting things which have been happening in California under the statewide social sciences committee which have not yet really come to fruition and may indeed run into some political trouble, but which represent again the "new look" in economic education.

Another sign of the maturity in this area is the appearance this fall of the new Journal of Economic Education, which it is hoped will open up this whole field to a much wider circle of communication.

If the only object of this paper were self-congratulation, we might well end at this point. It would hardly be worthwhile coming together, however, just to pat ourselves on the back. The achievements of these last twenty years, great as they have been, have constituted "development" rather than "research," if we can twist an old distinction to a slightly new meaning. That is to say, these developments have been an outgrowth of the existing state of the art and have developed what was implicit in the condition both of economics and of teaching twenty years ago. I suspect, however, that we have not really developed any ideas or organizations which were not implicit in 1949. In the absence of any really new "evolutionary potential" in these matters, the next twenty years are likely to see more of the same, piled higher and deeper, as the old joke goes about the meaning of the magic letters M. S. , Ph. D. after a man's name. It may be worth asking ourselves now, therefore, what are the unsolved problems in this field of economic education, in the hope that by directing our attention towards these, we may eventually be able to go beyond what has already been done, good as that is.

I have divided these two problems into two groups, the first of which includes problems of content and process and the second, problems of organization and structure.

1. Human Learning

The most fundamental problem of economic education is the problem of all education, which is that of understanding the process of human learning itself. In this regard we have to confess we still have a very long way to go. What we know about human learning, and we certainly know something, is largely a result of the accumulation of "folk knowledge." We must know something about human learning, obviously, otherwise we would not have been able to transmit the main content of the culture from one generation to the next with such astonishingly little loss. Nevertheless, we do not have any explicit testable models of what really constitutes the process of knowledge increase.

Industries may be divided into science-based industries, such as the electrical or nuclear industry, which could not exist without a basis in sophisticated science, and industries based on folk knowledge, such as the crafts, which rest on the accumulated knowledge of how to operate systems which are not really understood. Agriculture is a good example of an industry in transition. Traditional agriculture is based on the folk knowledge that if certain seeds are planted, certain plants will result, or if a cow is fed certain things it will produce milk. Modern agriculture is based increasingly on explicit physical, chemical, and biological systems and has become radically transformed as a result, increasing its labor productivity perhaps twenty times in the last hundred years.

Education is still at the stage of traditional agriculture. Long observation has confirmed the principle that if we put children into a school and expose them to certain inputs of information, they will learn something. How they learn -- both psychologically and physiologically -- is a profound mystery. Therefore, it is not surprising that the basic techniques of education have not changed very much in three thousand years and that the methods of Plato's academy are still so extensively practiced. Learning theory derived from animal experimentation is not much better than a slight elaboration of folk knowledge in the sense that it is still "black box" theory, a mere empirical relationship of inputs and outputs. Comparing animal learning with human learning is like studying a wheel barrow to understand the complicated systems of a jet plane. There is limited learning in each case.

At the other end of the scientific spectrum, we have something that we might call "philosophical learning theory," derived from reflection and insight, which again is not much better than elaborate folk knowledge, but again is not to be despised. It is an important principle, for instance, that learning is the growth of organized complexity and therefore is strongly parallel to the process of evolution. In a sense an application of this principle is the further proposition that selective and critical processes are of vital importance in both perception and learning. Just as the eye is only very superficially like a camera, so the learning process is only very superficially like printing, although something like printing operations do take place as images are transferred from one mind to another. What the modern theories of perception have taught us, however, is that we perceive things the way we do because it pays us to do so, that the mind is not a tabula rasa, but an extremely active process of image creation and that the senses are critics of the mind's voluble performances rather than authors. These principles apply also to the total learning process. A third proposition of philosophical learning theory is that values are learned along with everything else, that learning is a process of growth in a complex organization, and in this process we not only grow towards the payoffs, but we learn what the payoffs are towards which we will grow, which makes it a process of extreme complexity and dynamic instability.

A major deduction from philosophical learning theory is that we learn from mistakes provided that these mistakes do not threaten our identity. We do not learn from success, that is, from the fulfillment of predictions, but only from the failure of predictions. On the other hand, failure can have two results -- it can persuade the person either that he is "no good" and hence may diminish his capacity to learn in the future, or it may persuade him that he has made a mistake which can be corrected.

Perhaps the greatest problem of the organization of learning is how to prevent the learner making the first deduction from failure, and to encourage him in making the second. The great success of science as a learning process indeed is mainly a result of the fact that it developed a subculture within which the failure of expectations and experiment did not threaten the identity of the experimenter but rather reinforced it, whereas in schools and in daily life all too often failure erodes the identity of the learner and so prevents him from learning.

A final principle which emerges from philosophical learning theory is that in formal education, teaching and evaluation are inextricably mixed and that we learn indeed by having our mistakes evaluated either by ourselves or by others. It is of vital importance, however, that this evaluation be performed in such a way that it does not destroy the identity of the learner. Unfortunately, in much formal education this condition is not fulfilled, especially where there are class differences between the teacher and the learner as there are in the slums, or where the teacher is authoritative, sarcastic, and basically hostile to the student.

The principles enunciated above are, of course, perfectly general and they apply to economic education as to any other kind. In economic education, however, we are largely concerned with formal learning in a field of study where a good deal of informal and folk learning goes on. The social sciences in general face peculiar problems because of the fact that their subject matter is also the subject of a great deal of folk knowledge, much of which is valid and some of which is not. There is, therefore, an unlearning problem as well as a learning problem which the physical and biological sciences do not face so much. It is easier to unlearn the belief in the flat earth which our ordinary experience teaches us than it is to unlearn the view, for instance, that government debt is the same as private debt and must be judged by the same principles.

2. Level of Abstraction

A problem which is of particular importance in economic education and which arises directly out of the unsatisfactory state of learning theory might be described as the problem of "abstraction readiness." What we are mainly trying to do in economic education is not only to teach people certain facts and names, although these are important for purposes of discourse, but also to transmit certain abstract theories and principles. We are not just interested in teaching the names of the Secretary of the Treasury or the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, useful as this knowledge is in reading the New York Times. We are interested in helping the student to an understanding of general principles, in developing an ability to see particular cases as special cases of a larger set, and in developing the kind of knowledge which will enable the student, for instance, to perceive inflation as a result of unbalanced budgets and expansionary monetary policy rather than as a result of the mere unbridled greed of the merchant and speculator, which tends to be the point of view of folk economics. Just when students are ready for what kind of abstraction, however, is a very knotty point and in the absence of understanding of the process by which we learn abstractions we have to rely on trial and error and the development of a kind of folk wisdom. Senesh's work certainly suggests that abstractions can be introduced at a much earlier age than we had previously thought. On the other hand, it is highly probable that there are strong personal differences in this matter and that a child who is introduced to a certain level of abstraction too early may suffer a learning trauma -- "I am too good at math!" -- which will seriously hamper his development in the future. The damage done to the learning process by a hostile and authoritarian teacher of algebra can hardly be overestimated.

There may be a somewhat related problem, which one suspects has a smaller incidence, in overreadiness to abstract and an impatience or an incapacity with the concrete. One sees this perhaps more in the professional economist himself rather than in the amateur, who we hope is the principal recipient of economic education. The capacity of intellectuals especially to believe in their own abstractions and to mistake the abstraction for reality is not only a serious handicap to them personally, but may be a serious handicap in teaching which, after all, is done mainly by intellectuals or by people who have some pretentions in this direction. The teacher who has no proper sense of the limit of an abstraction is likely to produce either replicas of himself, if he is teaching at the graduate level, or disgruntled "practical men" who learn from him that theory is strictly for the birds. There is so much that is self-perpetuating in this kind of complaint that one almost despairs of doing anything about it.

3. Indoctrination of Values

A third problem which is perhaps less acute than it was twenty years ago and which is particularly a problem of economic education is the use of formal education for the legitimation of certain institutions and the indoctrination of certain attitudes and values. This problem has been batted around for so long among educationists that one is almost embarrassed to bring it up. Nevertheless, the ghost has an uneasy way of not lying down. The problem arises perhaps because the boundary between what is legitimate and what is illegitimate in this regard is a large vague no-man's land in which a sharp line cannot be drawn. On the one hand, it would be absurd to suppose that children growing up in any society will not be indoctrinated with the values around them. This is indeed precisely what we mean by the process of socialization of the child.

In the past, economic education, especially that financed by the business community, has not been able to escape a certain implication that it is used to legitimate existing institutions. Legitimating existing institutions is usually all right if the institutions are really legitimate, but then how will we know which institutions are legitimate and which are not? The boundaries are so hard to draw here that it is not surprising that the subject is rarely talked about in economic educator circles. To what extent indeed is economic education in the United States a substitute for the compulsory courses in Marxism-Leninism in the Soviet Union or the compulsory divinity and chapel of an earlier period? The one thing perhaps that has saved economic education is what saves moral education from these deadly and corrupting sins; that indoctrination is fortunately often ineffective, so that the student sometimes learns what he was not intended to learn.

At the level of formal economic education probably the best protection against the charge of indoctrination is the development of an approach based on comparative economic systems. The Comparative Economic Systems volume in the Holt Social Studies Curriculum is an excellent example of what can be done by means of the comparative systems approach to increase the student's self-awareness of his own system and understanding of other systems, without undermining his basic commitment to his own society. A more universal application of this kind of curriculum indeed would go a long way toward making peaceful coexistence a reality.

The problems of content and process which we have suggested are by no means exhaustive. All these problems, however, can be solved only in the context of some organization and structure. I propose to conclude this paper therefore with some observations on the problems which remain to be solved in this area.

4. Organization of Learning

The problem which might be called that of the organization of learning depends for its solution, of course, on an adequate human learning theory which, as suggested above, we do not yet have. The problem may be described by asking what are the optimum degrees and kinds of organization and structure in the learning process. Because of the irrepressible self-activity of the human mind, some learning will go on under any circumstances, but we have widely divergent theories of education in regard to structure, ranging from the tightly organized twenty-four-hours-a-day discipline of the military school to the free search and apparent disorder of Summerhill. Universities especially are struggling with the problem as to how far the course of studies of the student should be prescribed and how far he should be allowed free search and unguided inquiry. Organization theorists have discovered that in any organizational system there is an optimum degree of "slack," which is necessary as a reserve of organizational capacity in times of crisis. One might argue that the same is true of the educational process and that if "schooling" is scheduled too tightly the student will miss some of the most important opportunities for learning which arise randomly and spontaneously. Here again we are in an area in which the division between the legitimate and the illegitimate is a large no-man's land, and I have no great wisdom in regard to problems as to how this can be narrowed, except through the painful processes of trial and error. One of the great problems here is that we are not organized to learn from our mistakes. In the educational system, indeed, we tend to cover up our mistakes rather than to profit by them.

5. Organization of Teaching

Closely related to the organization of learning is the organization of teaching, both as a profession and as a social organization, such as the school. This includes problems of the training of teachers, conditions for entry into the profession, and possibly even more important and neglected, conditions for exit, that is, how to get people out of the profession who should not be in it. It involves also problems of the organization of schools and universities, problems of decentralization as well as centralization, problems of homogeneity versus heterogeneity, and indeed a number of issues which are particularly plaguing us at the moment. Here, as in other areas of education, we are continually having to make decisions in the absence of knowledge, although the development of knowledge for which at least there seems to be good evidence can have profound changes on the system. We notice this, for instance, in the whole movement for school integration which came out of the social psychological research of twenty or thirty years ago. We may well ask indeed in this regard where is the research which is going on now which is going to affect the organization structure of twenty years hence, and we may be hard put to find it. Hardly any other field illustrates better the proposition made earlier that this has been an era of development and not of research.

The most critical problem here, as I see it, is how we develop a structure and organization of formal education which will encourage lifetime learning and be visualized mainly as an organization by which people may acquire the skill of learning which they then use after they cease to be members of the organization. Perhaps the greatest single defect of our educational organization is that it creates a situation in which the skills of learning and the amount actually learned are competitive goods and in which all the payoffs are for learning something on the spot rather than for acquiring the capability of learning in the future. Economic education is by no means exempt from this challenge. It is all too often visualized as a printing operation by which the knowledge of the economy in the minds of the teacher or of economists is transferred with a resounding thump into the minds of relatively passive recipients. The problem of how we teach people to develop the skills of learning economics is something which has hardly yet been raised. Whether economic educators are ready to pioneer in thinking about this problem I do not really know.

6. Organization of Support

Finally we come to a problem which miraculously enough both underlies and overshadows all the others, which is the problem of support, that is, the economics of education and in particular the economics of economic education. Economic education is itself a segment, even if a minute one, of the economy. If we want this segment to grow, as most of us do, then we obviously have to look into the problem of the organization of its growth. The growth of a segment of the economy, however, can take place only because it is able to increase its total revenues in real terms, either by exchange (in this case, the sale of services) or through grants (that is, one-way transfers). Both of these, of course, reflect in some sense the demand for economic education and this is likely to be the determining factor, simply because conditions of supply only affect the total output of a sector under conditions of differential technical change and even then only where demand is elastic. The possibilities of technical change in education in terms of increasing the output per unit of input are not hopeless and indeed perhaps are brighter at the moment than they have been for two or three thousand years, but it is very hard to be very optimistic about them. For increasing the output of economic education, therefore, we must fall back pretty much on demand, either of those who want to buy it themselves or those who want to buy it for other people. Up to now economic education, like all education, has been very largely in what I have called the "grants economy," that is, supported mainly by one-way transfers from people who pay the bills because they think economic education is good for other people.

Here we must make a certain distinction between the demand for economists and the demand for people who have received economic education as noneconomists. The demand for economists is strong, though how long this will last I am not sure. The demand for economic education on the part of noneconomists themselves, for pure enlightenment without becoming economists, is to be optimistic, modest. Unfortunately, the biggest demand on the part of the grantors of grants is likely to be for indoctrination and for the kind of economic education which the suppliers of economic education may not want to supply. It is obvious that we are facing a pretty complex system, the end result of which is hard to predict. I have argued elsewhere that there is a great deal to be said for getting education, in part, out from under the grants economy and into the financial market through the establishment of educational banks giving, for instance, loans to all qualified students which can be repaid over a lifetime through a surcharge on the income tax. This kind of solution, however, which is of course a typical market solution, is much less likely to apply to economic education as such. Here we are going to have to rely on the organization of the school system and on getting economic education into a budget, or what is parallel, into the curriculum. This may mean, however, that the main economic contributors to economic education are going to be the people who are pushed out of the curriculum as the result of the expansion of economics. This is alternative costs with a vengeance and suggests that the problem of expanding economic education much beyond its present level may run into very severe difficulties.

This suggests a final question which is related to all three problems of organization, which is the question as to how far economics should be taught as a formal part of the curriculum, with a separate course and a separate teacher, and how far it should be taught as a component of other courses and other disciplines. There is a natural prejudice on the part of economists to want to organize it as a separate course and a separate part of the organization. Nevertheless, if we are concerned with the increase of economic knowledge rather than the increase of teachers of economics, it may well be that a wiser strategy would be to seek to insert economic principles and economic illustrations in the appropriate places in other courses in the curriculum. The Joint Council on Economic Education has indeed practised this strategy, but it might be carried even further.

There are three places at least where there would seem to be substantial opportunity for this. One is in the mathematics curriculum where that part of economics which is really applied mathematics could easily be introduced. For instance, when the student is studying simultaneous equations he could use as illustrations demand and supply equilibrium, or even Walrasian equations and Keynesian equations. When he is studying calculus, he could study marginal analysis. This is one place, it seems to me, where the present organization of education is severely handicapped in making opportunities for the organization of learning. A second place where there is already a large amount of economics in the curriculum is in the new (or even the old) approaches to geography. These are indeed so exciting, especially in the use of simulation and classroom games, that some economists at any rate should be sharply aware of what is going on and be ready to take advantage of these opportunities as they arise. Another discipline of course in which it is possible to introduce economics is into history and the newer textbooks seem to be well aware of this. The one "new curriculum" which seems to be almost unaware of economics is, oddly enough, the sociology curriculum. My acquaintance with it is quite superficial, but I confess that they do not seem to me to have the excitement and originality of the new geography proposals.

In conclusion, therefore, one may return to a principle enunciated at the beginning of this paper, that the changes of the last twenty years have come mainly from the persistent pressure of a relatively small number of small organizations. If, therefore, we want to make changes in the next twenty years along the lines which this paper has implied, it will be necessary to set up organizations either as branches of existing ones or as new ones which apply the same kind of gentle persistent pressure. On the larger scale, I have argued that we desperately need a major organization for the study of human learning and that this is a research priority which, to my mind, far exceeds such relative trivia as the exploration of space. In the narrow sphere of economic education, we are well supplied with existing organizations. But we need to continue and reinforce their mission in the development of feedback in learning from mistakes and in the application of persistent pressure in introducing economic ideas at all places in the curriculum where they are appropriate. As part of a major push for research in human learning we might even visualize a new organization, shall we say for research in economic education, which by persistent pressure will be able to achieve in the next generation a continuation along rather different lines of the successes which existing organizations have achieved in the last twenty years.

THE EXPERIENCE IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES

F. André Paquette

Executive Secretary
American Council of Teachers
of Foreign Languages

Presented at the
Grove Park Institute of the Consortium of Professional Associations
for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs
Asheville, North Carolina
June 10-15, 1969

THE EXPERIENCE IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES[1]

When I was invited to address the participants in this symposium, Saul Cohen suggested that I speak to four areas: an inventory of what has happened -- especially with reference to teacher training -- in our segment of the teaching profession; an evaluation of what has happened in the immediate past; a review of present conditions; and finally, some thoughts about new goals and new procedures. For the inventory, I should like to present a chronology of major events in the foreign language field since 1952; I am going to go over this very rapidly, assuming that if you're interested later, you will turn to the massive documentation (historical reports and tons of occasional publications) available through the Modern Language Association/American Council on Teaching Foreign Languages Materials Center or the Modern Language Association/Educational Resources Information Center Clearinghouse on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

My understanding of the reason for this four-part approach should be made clear. I want to raise issues that have nothing to do with teaching French or teaching foreign languages. I want to raise issues and pose questions that I think are the very purpose of this conference -- questions for all disciplines.

In 1952, with what then appeared to be rather massive foundation support, the Modern Language Association (MLA) initiated its Foreign Language Program. Many of the activities of this Program were aimed at the training and retraining of teachers and assessing the place of foreign languages in American education. Shortly after 1952, an organization called the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages came into existence. Since that time it has become quite influential in the area of foreign language pedagogy. And in the 1955 Reports of the Working Committees of that conference, Stephen Freeman, Vice President of Middlebury College, chaired a committee which devoted its report to an outline for improving the training and retraining of foreign language teachers. Shortly after that the MLA issued its rather famous statement: Qualifications for

---

[1] An address delivered at the CONPASS Meeting on "The Disciplines in the Continuum of Teacher Education," 11 June 1969, Grove Park Inn, Asheville, N. C.

Secondary School Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages, where the MLA described three levels of competence (minimal, good, superior) in listening, speaking, reading, and writing the foreign language, professional preparation, applied linguistics, culture, and civilization. The qualifications statement was one of three official policy statements that the MLA issued. Another was on the Values of Foreign Language Study; a third was a policy statement on Foreign Language Degree Requirements. One sees here the beginnings of a perfect theoretical model for curriculum development in a discipline. We've been working with this perfect model for more than fifteen years and have achieved a great deal -- which I will try to summarize. However, I will suggest at the end of my summary inventory that in spite of this seemingly perfect theoretical model and significant gains, we (the foreign language profession) appear now to have as far to go as when we started in 1952.

We began by defining what students should learn and describing the educational values of that study; we then defined what teachers ought to have by way of competence in order to bring about that learning; and then during the period of 1955-1965, we conducted more than seven surveys of teacher training in institutions of higher education and we supported detailed studies of the instruction going on in schools of education. In 1956 the MLA decided to reach outside the foreign language teaching profession to involve other educators in this process of trying to reestablish and reconstitute the place of foreign languages in American education. So they brought together a foreign language teacher, two deans of education; seven heads of professional associations like National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, NASDTEC, National Education Association, etc.; a college president; a chief state school officer; and others. These twelve people, after considerable discussion, commended the MLA for its statement about the values of foreign language study and for its very comprehensive statement of the qualifications for secondary school teachers. They encouraged the development of guidelines for teacher preparation programs to create these paragons that had been described. They then recommended that certification of foreign language teachers be changed from "course-counting" to "program-approval," and they suggested that institutions of higher learning attempt to develop such approvable programs. The final suggestion of this nonforeign language group was that the MLA or others in the profession try to develop tests of proficiency.

As you know, after this first five years of the MLA Foreign Language Program, the Congress became concerned with a number of things; fortunately for the foreign language field, we had five years of planning behind us. So with our plan, William Riley Parker went to Washington and convinced Congress to include foreign languages in the National Defense Education Act of 1958. At the same time the MLA, in an association policy decision, made the Foreign Language Program a permanent part of its organizational structure. It should be noted that the Program was oriented primarily to the teaching of foreign languages in the schools even though the constituency of the MLA is largely college and university professors of English and foreign languages and literatures. So, in 1959 with generous funding from the National Defence Education Act (NDEA), the MLA began the development of proficiency tests which came to be known as the MLA Foreign Language Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students. The tests were developed in the seven areas I mentioned: listening comprehension, speaking, reading, writing, professional preparation, culture and civilization, and applied linguistics in five languages: French, German, Italian, Spanish, and Russian, each test having three forms. As you can well imagine this involved hundreds of members of the foreign language teaching profession. These tests came to be used in the NDEA institutes to evaluate participants at the beginning and at the end of the programs, measuring thereby the progress achieved during the institute. In 1959, we began the foreign language institutes so, as suggested by Professor Glass, we were beginning the definition of instructional objectives, competence needed by, and the training of, teachers. With funds from NDEA we began the other part of the perfect curriculum development model; the development of new teaching materials based on an audiolingual approach with carefully defined linguistic content and aimed at developing four skills instead of just reading and writing. And so, we moved toward implementation of the perfect model.

Beyond all this, from 1959 to 1961, the MLA and other groups conducted some 20 detailed studies of the teaching of foreign languages in American education: the needs, for example, for manpower in the neglected languages (Hindi, Urdu, Tagalog, etc.), needs of industry in terms of foreign language competence, and needs in training college instructors.

In 1961 the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages devoted another entire set of committee reports to a discussion of the preparation of secondary and college teachers. That same year the MLA cooperated with two other agencies in creating specialized films in second-language teaching techniques, designed to explore with students and prospective teachers, basic principles about the nature of language, the organization of language, the sounds of language, the meaning of words, and specific techniques for foreign language instruction. In 1963, with foundation and the U. S. Office of Education support, the MLA brought together what it judged to be twelve of the leading scholars in the profession to ask what needed to be done at the college and university levels. How could we close the teacher-training circle? As a result of their discussions, the MLA published what has come to be known as the "McAllister Report": a publication which cost the MLA executive secretary much abuse at the hands of some of his colleagues because it suggested that graduate schools teach such things as anthropology and culture and civilization. In 1963, the Carnegie Foundation again supported an MLA-sponsored study to develop guidelines for teacher education programs in modern foreign languages. Thus, the entire plan laid out in 1956 by the group of non-foreign language people I mentioned earlier proceeded to the development and the publication of the Guidelines for Teacher Education Programs in Modern Foreign Languages.

Since 1959, the MLA, at the request of the Office of Education, had carried on evaluations of the summer and year-long NDEA institutes. To make sure that it was not simply the foreign language teacher establishment supporting its own points of view, the MLA again went outside the profession to get deans of education, professors of education, school superintendents, etc., to evaluate the 1964 institutes. The result was a publication called The Education of the Modern Foreign Language Teac[illegible] for American Schools authored by Joseph Axelrod. As we reached about the tenth year of the Foreign Language Program in the early 60's, the MLA sought support from a foundation to conduct an evaluation of its own Foreign Language Program and of the impact of the first five years of NDEA on foreign language instruction in the United States. So it reached outside the foreign language profession once more, and with the advice of the Foreign Language Program Advisory Committee and other educational leaders, published a report called NDEA and Modern Foreign Languages; this study was headed by John Deekhof and has become, obviously, the Deekhof Report. All this was accomplished in little more than a decade. If you look back over it and study it carefully, it seems to be the absolutely pefect theoretical model for curriculum development. Besides all this, the MLA had created the Center for Applied Linguistics, had nourished it, and had turned it loose on its own. It had developed and produced Modern Spanish and Continuing Spanish, revolutionary beginning and intermediate level Spanish textbooks for college. It had produced cooperative tests in French, Spanish, Italian, German, and Russian for beginning and intermediate students. It had produced guides for the teaching of foreign languages in the elementary school, and had reached out in the last few years to fund the production of a textbook on methods of teaching English as a second language and one for modern Portuguese. This is a rapid chronology of what has gone on in the foreign language teaching profession. We have had very generous support from NDEA, from foundations, and from the general funds of the MLA.

Where do we stand today? Let me give a quick, personal evaluation of this decade. On the positive side, it is clear that we have a great many more enrollments in foreign languages than we had in 1952. The only serious deficiency in that general picture is that Classics enrollments in the schools have declined in absolute terms; curiously enough, in the last few years they have increased in absolute terms in higher education. We have a greater variety of foreign language curricula. One of the great concerns in the early days of NDEA was that if the government got into the business of promoting the production of instructional material, we would end up with a national curriculum. The fact of the matter is that we had a national curriculum prior to NDEA; it was two years of reading, writing, and translation in any and every language for every student who ever thought of taking a foreign language. Now we have a much greater range of curricula; we have longer sequences in many school districts, some schools as many as 12 years, some six, some 10, and we have a greater variety in the methods of teaching foreign languages. Obviously there has been a significant increase in the number of people involved in the teaching of foreign languages -- almost _all_ foreign languages at _all_ levels. One of the most beneficial outcomes of this whole development and of the funding under NDEA has been the emergence of a great many foreign language leaders at the local, state, and national level. You may well say that they would have emerged anyway; possibly, but they would not have come to the fore as quickly nor, it seems to me, in as many circumstances. We have gained at least a few insights into the nature of language and the nature of language learning.

On the negative side, we have not achieved wide acceptance _in practice_ of the principle of "recognizing proficiency however acquired." I raise this issue because I think it applies to other disciplines. One of the great demands that comes to us daily from students is, "Why do I have to sit through that course? I can get it in one-third of the time by doing X, Y, or Z." This is particularly true in the foreign language field. The fact of the matter is that we have a great many students who live in foreign countries for eight months, a year, two years, and they develop more competence in speaking a language than they can get in almost any set of courses. So, from the point of view of students in our field, the concept of recognizing proficiency (competency, if you will) is a critical one, but this principle has not gained wide acceptance either by specialists in the foreign language field or anyone who is affected by the foreign language field. This failure manifests itself in the realm of continuity from one level of instruction to the other; we have elementary school foreign language programs followed by seventh-grade teachers who start off just as though the kids were in their first day of the language, and the high school teachers start all over again and so do the professors of freshmen in college. In effect, I am asking, "What good are the ten-year sequences? The six-year sequences?" We have not seen on the part of teachers or institutions of education any indication that they are willing to "recognize proficiency however acquired." High schools and colleges still require students to sit through x number of courses.

What concerns me most is that we see little evidence that teachers are going to be certified on the basis of proficiency.

Secondly, in our field we have not thought carefully about wide acceptance of the teaching of foreign languages in the elementary schools.

Thirdly, we have not contributed markedly to the education of non-English mother tongue or limited bilingual children. After 15 years of professional effort, millions of kids who ought to be the concern of the foreign language teaching profession still go to schools where the curriculum is completely taught in English. As an Office of Education staff member said, "We make sure they forget Spanish by the third grade so that they can take it as a foreign language in high school."

Fourthly, I can put this very simply, we have not affected regular higher education programs one iota. We have neither trained nor retrained more teachers than prior to NDEA; that is, our turnover in the foreign language teaching profession is, if anything, larger than before 1958.

Finally, it seems to me that we have not focused systematically on identifying, educating and using leadership -- career people. It seems to me that if in our field, as in others, we are to move anywhere, we must start considering how we are going to develop key career people who are going to keep education moving forward in spite of all the problems mentioned this far in this symposium.

Let me move now to a partial review of the current situation in foreign languages. Where are we today? First, let me take a few negatives. (I am not trying to be comprehensive; I am just trying to be suggestive.) First of all, Foreign Languages in the Elementary Schools (FLES) is under attack. There are many reasons for this, but two of them are justified. One is that FLES was totally unrealistic in its objectives. Many educators overestimated what could be accomplished in the elementary schools. Second, and perhaps much more critical, we foreign language specialists, as discipline specialists, attempted to intrude our area into the elementary schools. We viewed FLES as a downward extension of a highly specialized sequence. We did not consider it in the complete context of elementary education. These are the two things which I feel account for a large part of the failure of attempting to introduce a foreign language experience to a great many Americans in the elementary schools.

Secondly, foreign language entrance and degree requirements at all levels are under attack. I am convinced that this is part of a much larger attack on degree requirements in general; but to a large extent

I feel that institutions of higher education, for whatever reasons, have not distinguished clearly between entrance and degree requirements, between language and literature requirements.

Next, proficiency testing, it seems to me, is about to disappear. I associate this with the failure of higher education, state departments of education, local hiring agencies, etc., to accept the notion of "recognizing proficiency however acquired." I sometimes think these institutions don't even want to know whether their majors or teachers are doing as well as high school students. (As a matter of fact, I once suggested, about four years ago, that a great many college instructors might take the MLA Proficiency Tests, but I haven't seen many names on the registration rosters.) There is limited use of the tests by the states; there is little use by higher education. This has made it impossible to improve the tests or the procedures by which one assesses proficiency. Also the kind of financial support which is needed for this program is now lacking.

Recently developed methodologies are under attack; I won't go into details here. I think it is enough to say that one of the things that we have learned in the last fifteen years in the foreign language teaching profession is that it is ridiculous to think of a methodology for all teachers.

On the plus side, it seems to me that we do have, after fifteen years, a new focus for professionalism among foreign language teachers. Until the MLA created the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages in 1967, there was no locus for all foreign language professional activities. This association is open to teachers of all languages at all levels of education. Still in existence are associations such as the American Association of Teachers of German, the American Association of Teachers of Arabic, the Chinese Language Teachers Association, the Association of Teachers of Japanese -- all separate foreign language organizations. We have developed the capacity for producing an annual bibliography on the teaching of foreign languages. We now have an Educational Resources Information Center Clearinghouse on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. We have just initiated an annual review of research in our field. Hence, we have the bibliography, the data bank, and a review of research, which ought to pull things together into a useable format for both scholars and teachers.

Finally, we have what a great many people view as a tragedy developing, but what I see as a real opportunity. Foreign language degree requirements are changing in a great many institutions; there are new demands on the foreign language students, we have to recognize within each discipline that the system of constraints which has held our subject matters in the curriculum at all levels of American education are changing, and they are changing rapidly. I view this development in my field as an opportunity for foreign languages -- finally -- to join the humanities.

Let me move to the projection of new goals; I am not really going to give goals, I am going to raise issues for the future. "Let us be bold," the Office of Education has said. When I agreed to come here, I assumed several things; one thing I assumed was that every one of us would try to "tell it like it is," so I would like to try to tell it like it is (1) to my foreign language colleagues, (2) to my colleagues in other disciplines, (3) to fellow teachers, and (4) to the U. S. Office of Education. I am taking this approach because I also assumed that out of this conference should come proposals for totally new approaches to the problem of teacher education.

To my foreign language friends, I want to reiterate a couple of points I made publicly in December. Those of you who are in other disciplines, I hope, will translate for your disciplines.

> Why is there a massive assault on degree requirements, and why did some 400 college and university foreign language department chairmen feel compelled to assemble at the 1968 Annual Meeting of the MLA to discuss this aspect of the current crisis in American education? Foreign language teachers must ask again and answer again the question, what is the relationship of foreign language study to the central purpose of education? Why is it so difficult for so many foreign language teachers to make the case for foreign language study to their fellow educators and the public? Is it because they dare not state the obvious: that under the protective umbrella of foreign language entrance and degree requirements we have permitted, promoted, and tacitly ignored not only poor language teaching but just plain poor teaching? Have we come to believe, in our security of B. A. blanket requirements, that any kind of a foreign language experience has some salutary educational effect on humans?
>
> We have to be reminded -- as Samuel Lieberman, a Classicist at Queens College, reminded me recently -- that "Knowledge of another's language does not, in itself, lead to sympathy, brotherly love, or peace any more than its ignorance leads to war. Otherwise we would never have civil wars or riots within a country or alliances between countries with different languages. Who are our most successful students? Aren't the vast majority those who become foreign language

teachers and professors? If this is so, we face the supreme irony that what we are actually doing is perpetuating ourselves. Our real work consists not of spreading knowledge of foreign languages, cultures, and literatures to our people, but of creating foreign language teachers. Is this our intention?"

So it will not be enough to ask what the relationship of foreign language study is to the central purpose of education; we will also have to ask, what kind of experience? I am confident that if we pose these two questions and attempt to propose at least tentative answers we will arrive at my third conviction.

If we are a profession,then we must assume the responsibilities which any profession does; and if we are to constitute ourselves the foreign language teaching profession, then we must make ourselves the custodians of American foreign language resources. To do this we will have to extend the boundaries of our past concerns and become involved in two related problems: The first is to help provide bilingual education for millions of Americans for whom the mother tongue is not the language of ordinary school instruction. I tried to reflect this conviction in editing the March 1969 issue of the Foreign Language Association journal. The second is our responsibility to assess, protect, maintain, and defend the natural linguistic resources of our countries. For too long we have allowed a few individuals to bear these responsibilities; we must do more than offer token support. We must make it very clear to any who do not understand that it is not un-American to be bilingual. On the contrary, there is every reason to believe that we should envision and strive for bilingualism in every country in this hemisphere.

Some of you not immediately concerned with this problem may think that I am overstating the case, but I just read in The New York Times that the number of Puerto Ricans in New York has just surpassed the one-million mark.

We must dare to pose questions never before posed and to ask anew others answered too selfishly and too glibly in the past. What is the public image of foreign language learning in our schools and colleges? Must we retreat to dues alone to finance work which requires

> massive governmental and foundation support? Who will plead the cause of the humanities before our national assemblies? How many foreign language teachers are aware of what the United States Congress, in its last session, did to the National Endowment for the Humanities? What is the relevance of the humanities?

I couldn't help thinking as I listened to Professor Glass last night that even with the massive support we have had in foreign languages, it is infinitesimal in comparison to the support which the sciences have received, and it seems to me that we have to have significant support beyond that which we already have received. I know that it is easy to criticize the fact that we go to the moon but have the kinds of situations that we do in American education today. It is true though, and that is telling it like it is.

So, to my colleagues in other disciplines I would say -- have you considered similar questions? Have you, for example, considered an approach that we have recently taken in the foreign language field? We sponsored a National Symposium on the Teaching of Foreign Languages in the Elementary Schools in which no speaker was a foreign language person. What I am suggesting is that if we are going to change the place of the disciplines in American education, we have to engage in a dialogue with one another and with a great many other educators. And as I said in the introduction to the report on that symposium, if you are going to have a dialogue, you have to spend some time listening. So, we spent some time listening, because it seems to me that what I said about our attempt to introduce foreign languages in the elementary schools is critical. That 50% of the curriculum that all 20 disciplines are trying to get into is probably there if we look for it, if we seek ways of cooperating with one another, if every one of us does not attempt to move his areas as a separate academic discipline right down through prenursery school.

To you as fellow teachers I would like to pose a couple of general but critical questions: Have we proved that American higher education is incapable of renewing itself? I think we ought to consider this a possibility. I think we ought to consider the possibility of creating totally new corporate systems for approaching the problems of American education. I cited four reports in my inventory of our attempts to improve foreign language curriculum. There are easily two dozen others that one might cite which were specifically addressed to those in control of undergraduate and graduate education. I could take you down the list and show you where less than 1% of what has been suggested in either a theoretical or a practical sense has been implemented. The fact of the matter is that whether it is English Composition or French 201 or Spanish 101, we are still supporting plush full professorships with the money we get from forcing everyone to take courses at the undergraduate level. We still believe, for example, that every graduate student in French -- whether he has the competence or not -- has the right to teach French 101 to undergraduates. I can't say what the assumptions are in other fields, but the fact of the matter is that in practice we consider undergraduate education as a major financial supportive system to graduate education. I am asking again, "Have we proved that it is impossible to change American higher education?"

Secondly, have we reason to consider whether all money for teacher education should not be channeled through local educational agencies? Let teacher education enter into contracts with private industry -- if it is with Berlitz, so be it; if it is with the University of Texas, so be it. Whoever it is, someone needs to get the job done for that local educational agency. What I am suggesting is that we have changed foreign language teaching in the schools, but by and large we have not changed foreign language teaching in the colleges.

Thirdly, has anyone of us in the disciplines considered the possibility that our subject matter area really ought to be a supportive one rather than a dominating one? Is it conceivable that in order to bring a wider perspective to political science, the teaching of French ought to be available to the student who might want to learn to read the original text in French so that he can bring a new point of view to the discussions of political science? One could suggest many examples; what I am asking basically is this: Have we become too egocentric as subject matter specialists?

Fourthly, have we considered the student? What I am saying is especially true in my own field. I think we have assumed that every student must develop reading, listening, speaking, and writing ability. It used to be that all one had to develop was reading and translation ability, now we have gone to the other extreme. Is it possible that at the secondary level, at the undergraduate level, at the graduate level, what we really ought to be doing is providing students with a great many foreign language opportunities for purposes which they define. Can the same question be asked in other disciplines?

It seems to me that one of the goals of education is to get people to conceive of what might be as well as what is or has been. As we look at the processes of the mode of scientific inquiry, or the inductive approach to foreign language learning, or approaches to education in any other areas, this has to be at least one of our goals. It seems to me that if we can conceive of the possibilities of building a space platform which will circle the moon for 20 years, then we ought to conceive of the possibility of bilingual education in the United States for everybody. We ought to be able to conceive of the possibility of cooperation between political scientists and foreign language teachers. We ought to conceive of the possibility of not having a third-grade dropout rate among Spanish Americans which is appalling. We ought to conceive of the possibility of a superintendent who won't classify monolingual Portuguese children as "special education" pupils. For too long in academic institutions of all kinds we have chosen to be socially isolated and we cannot be so any longer.

To my colleagues in the Office of Education, one or two words. In the last six months, this is the third conference sponsored by your office where I and representatives of other academic disciplines have been asked what their professional associations can do to help direct or redirect Office of Education policies. I don't mind repetition, because, as you know, in the foreign language profession that has been our "stock in trade" for the last few years, but I must say that I sense a developing credibility gap. I don't know now whether you really want to know what we think. What makes me doubt your intentions even more is that the amount of money devoted to basic studies has obviously diminished -- in absolute terms -- in the last few years. The eleven categories of all that were outlined at the Education Professions Development Act Leadership Training Institute suggest to me that the present policy of funding of the Office of Education does nothing more than promote the status quo, because it gives a little to the foreign language department, it gives a little to the A-V department, it gives something to every department; it gives some to this, that, and the other. And I remind you that one of our biggest problems in foreign languages has been getting departments to work together.

In the foreign language field we would like to build on our successes and learn from our failures. It seems to me, though, that those of you who come under tremendous pressure from politicians and from educators in every field have somehow to decide whether you really want to hear from the basic studies and whether you want to fund anything in the basic studies or not. Or do you want to "tell it like it is" and say, "Listen, we are not interested in the basic studies anymore. We are taking a whole new approach."

My only observation is this: the kind of educational improvement outlined by Professor Glass last evening and myself this morning takes money, lots of money, and the fact of the matter is that we live in a society where money moves fast. If we are going to change American education, it is going to take money. Guidelines don't mean a thing if we can't have money to implement them, if we don't have money to improve or change higher education, it won't change. It takes money to change American education.

Let me conclude: In editing a report on the symposium, which I mentioned earlier (the report was called The Student's World Is the World), a colleague of mine decided to include a section called "Managing Change." The idea for this section of our report came from a foreign language supervisor in Arizona. In his state's newsletter he said, "Our professional responsibility is not to stop change or to stampede it, but to manage it. A positive attitude toward change and acceptance of its normality or desirability appears requisite to its effective management."

A few decades ago, an educator asked, "Dare the schools build a new social order?" My question is, "Can they?"

THE THIRD LEVEL OF INCOMPETENCE

Action Without Thought

"Do it"

Jerry Rubin

"Accordingly, it is impossible to speak of actions except in so far as it will be governed by a previous contemplation; and vice versa, a contemplation, or being within one's self, is nothing but a projecting of future action . . . We do not live to think, but the other way around; we think in order that we may succeed in surviving . . . Without a strategic retreat into the self . . . human life is impossible . . . Buddha . . . Mahomet . . . Jesus . . ."

Ortega Y Gasset

III

The third level wonders what purpose all the proliferation of questions has, sometimes giving off more heat than light. "Since everybody agrees something ought to be done; let's do it. If they'd all stop talking and feasibility-studying a while, maybe we could."

It is fundamentally the most assured, in the utility of its role, and most confident about its ultimate success, as the facilitator of opinion into practice. It corrals the herd bulls.

Its humor is quick and functional, not widely ranging or indulgent. Its tone is brisk, its eyes are clear. It is concerned with how-to, not look-at.

It speaks of "the gradual advance in the involvement of scholars we have already witnessed in recent years." It sees no mass conversion, no headlong rush, "no academic Sadie Hawkins day," but a properly dwindling influence for those not sponsoring more marriages.

It addresses itself to the long routine, after "the oratory fades away and the rhetoric loses its punch." It does not introspect, on where its own impetus comes from. No cultural imperative is offered as to the necessity of this or that commitment, no emotional appeal for one. No spiritual demands that make men nervous. It gets the job done.

It is indispensable. And, as Paul Ward predicts it gives rise to some Sharp questions.

WHAT MIGHT BE DONE THROUGH ASSOCIATIONS, UNIVERSITY STRUCTURES, AND CAREER PATTERNS TO INCREASE INVOLVEMENT OF THE SCHOLAR

Paul F. Sharp

President
Drake University

Presented at the
Grove Park Institute of the Consortium of Professional Associations
for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs
Asheville, North Carolina
June 10-15, 1969

WHAT MIGHT BE DONE THROUGH ASSOCIATIONS, UNIVERSITY STRUCTURES, AND CAREER PATTERNS TO INCREASE INVOLVEMENT OF THE SCHOLAR

To call upon a university president to prepare a paper during the commencement season when our campus disarray comes into unceremonial focus is an act of faith that must border on the reckless. For a president to accept such an untimely assignment proves that he is equally innocent.

Our assigned topic this morning, with its emphasis upon the word "mechanisms" suggests that this is a "nuts and bolts" session in which the "how to do it," cookbook approach will provide palatable recipes for easy application. We will get no further than this unless we insist, first off, that the goals we seek will dictate our use of the mechanisms. These goals must certainly include the quality of instruction and the values it imparts, as well as the types of instruction, and a modification of the credentials-oriented society that higher education has become; these goals must also include our commitment to the urgency of involving scholars in the planning, development, and execution of teacher education programs through all their phases.

Our title carries in it a certain note of pragmatism that we must not deny if we truly wish to advance the cause of involving scholars in teacher education. After the oratory fades away and the rhetoric loses its punch, we are left with the question, how do we get it done?

We have come a long way since Bestor, Rickover, and others called to national attention the shoddy state of affairs that prevailed in much of teacher preparation. One measure of the change is the fact that it is no longer thought revolutionary in "educationist" circles to say that the greatest weakness in teacher preparation is "the failure to recognize the importance and extreme complexity of the job of determining content; what to teach in any given situation" (Maucker, pp. 75-76). Nor is it regarded as more than bad taste to suggest to our colleagues in the disciplines that good teaching is rather more than an art or skill inherited in a genetic code.

Against a background of many years of historical development of the split between "educationists" and "academicians," we have made modest but important progress during the past two decades. We have a very long way to go, however, before we can seriously claim that scholars outside our schools of education are yet consciously involved on any scale in teacher preparation either on their own campuses or through national associations. The fact is, of course, they have been deeply involved, though often without giving it any thought, through the large numbers of students who pass through their courses shortly to become certified as teachers and soon to join a profession for which they are all too often badly trained, poorly informed and ill-equipped to assume the roles they must play in our society.

Associationalism is bone-deep in the American character. Associations are so much a part of our way of doing things that American intellectuals, who reject so much else, gladly associate with the same enthusiasms that war veterans, lovers of the native landscape, life insurance underwriters, or morticians join forces to achieve their ends.

Thus, it is not accidental that our title asks us first what might be done through associations. This is tribute to the fact that they possess powers of reward and punishment, professional recognition and political influence, and the national visibility to make a substantial impact. Indeed, they must become deeply and significantly involved in teacher education if we are to improve the quality of both the process through which we educate our teachers and the product, the teacher.

Happily, we have already seen professional associations and learned societies involve scholars in framing guidelines for elementary and secondary curricula, as well as institutes for teachers at every state of their preparation. In recent years a variety of programs have expressed this growing involvement with results ranging from indifferent to highly successful.

Many of these have been analyzed for us in this conference. I should like to turn to another point of impact that is currently important, the involvement of scholars in the development of new standards of accreditation for teacher education programs.

After years of uncertainty and considerable acrimony, the National Council on Accreditation assigned to the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education the full responsibility for accrediting teacher preparation programs. The old council, in my judgment, was singularly ill-suited to carry out this critical assignment for it represented almost all segments of educational interest except those most vitally concerned; the teacher-scholars in the teaching fields. This is today changing and three representatives from learned societies serve as members of the NCATE.

This is a modest but significant step. It must now be followed by a greater use of scholars from these and similar fields on visiting teams and on regional committees. Administrators have too often served in these roles. They must be replaced by scholars representing the disciplines.

More promising in the long run is the involvement of scholars in the development of new accreditation standards for NCATE, standards that must remain under constant review and open to change through the leadership of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. In 1966 the AACTE created an Evaluative Criteria Study Committee to suggest new standards of accreditation. In its work the ECSC has sought to cooperate closely with representatives of all the concerned areas, including the teaching fields. ECSC published its initial draft in December, 1967 and a revised draft in April, 1968. It proposes to submit its final recommendations next fall.

ECSC has recognized the importance of working with the professional associations and learned societies in improving teacher education. In both the basic and advanced programs, the proposed standards call attention to the guidelines prepared by professional associations for the education of teachers and other school service personnel.

Institutions seeking teacher preparation accreditation are called upon to develop their own institutional rationale with "due consideration for the recommendations in these guidelines." This will require these institutions to consider and give evidence of serious attention to the recommendations of professional organizations. It does not insist, as many hoped, that each institution must meet every guideline to be accredited. These provisions are important, however, for they do require:

1. That the institution's rationale for its programs show awareness of professional guidelines, and it should demonstrate why practices differ from professional recommendations.

2. This indirect involvement avoids the impossible requirement that visiting teams consist of representatives of every discipline in teaching fields. Teams of this size would no doubt pose impossible burdens upon host institutions, and the NCA has discouraged the proliferation of accrediting bodies.

3. Any attempt to incorporate every recommendation by professional organizations would lengthen teacher education programs to several years beyond the limits of acceptability.

ECSC action encourages professional associations to prepare guidelines for accreditation. The committee, moving with what may be undue caution between undesirable extremes, clearly has sought to recognize the major contribution such guidelines can make in improving the quality of teacher education throughout the country.

In recognition of the importance of these provisions in the proposed standards, the Associated Organizations for Teacher Education has recently published a brochure to assist member organizations in framing guidelines. AACTE's contribution is a valuable one in advancing the relationship between professional educators and scholars in the teaching fields.

Professional associations can make a major contribution in yet another area. The need for underwriting and encouraging massive research efforts essential to our present urgent needs is everywhere apparent.

An illustration in the newly proposed NCATE standards immediately comes to mind. In what must be called an act of faith, or possibly in anticipation of the future, the standards ask each institution "to present evidence of the quality of the teachers it has produced" (5. 1).

Now all of us know that every institution engaged in teacher preparation produces effective, successful, sensitive and well-trained teachers. Their catalogs and brochures assure us of this. But it is equally obvious that a great deal of basic research remains to be done before institutions can adequately evaluate their graduates. Whatever answers this research ultimately develops, it must include an evaluation of the content knowledge of the teacher.

This requires the cooperation of professional associations in interpreting research findings and in disseminating them widely. Association leadership must insist that this research be meaningful and critical rather than the sales pitch types of evidence frequently presented and tolerated. And while we are studying the problems of ascertaining the competence of teachers, perhaps we will also discover the importance of evaluating the learning of the children taught by these teachers as another measure of the effectiveness of the program.

Liberal arts colleges have long claimed superior teacher preparation programs because of emphasis upon work in disciplinary fields. Under the proposed standards they will have an opportunity to prove their case. Each institution is called upon to present, in whatever ways it wishes, evidence of the quality of the teachers it trains. Unfortunately in the recent feasibility study in which the new standards were applied to eight institutions of widely varying types and functions, the liberal arts colleges did not present evidence materially different from the others. This is a very limited sampling, of course, and with time more sophisticated measures will no doubt be presented to evaluate the effectiveness of the training as revealed in the performance of the teachers. Here again, professional associations can be helpful by providing top scholars as consultants and advisors to institutions engaged in teacher education.

At yet another point the new standards call upon the imagination of professional leaders in the disciplines. In an attempt to encourage institutional experimentation and innovation, the standards urge institutions seeking accreditation to demonstrate flexibility and variety in their programs. This is emphasized by the assertion early in the document that "the new standards and evaluative criteria permit a great deal of latitude in designing and conducting preparation programs."

This provision recognizes that there is no single design for teacher preparation and that major changes may be required of many programs before they achieve relevance and current utility. Each institution, therefore, is encouraged to experiment and to create those patterns of teacher education best calculated to fulfill its educational mission.

This effort at flexibility is encouraging. But I am not optimistic that it will be implemented very often unless scholars in the teaching fields also join in a serious and sustained participation in the planning and development of programs on the campus.

Several major new elements appear in the proposed standards that should be called to your attention since they invite participation by national associations, both directly and through their members:

1. Evaluation of graduates at the terminal point of their preparation program and after they are in-service (5. 1 and G-5. 1).

2. The use of evaluation results to improve preparation programs (5. 2 and G-5. 2).

3. Long-range planning of teacher education programs (5. 3 and G-5. 2).

4. The use of professional organization guidelines for the preparation of teachers and school service personnel (1. 35, 1. 43, 1. 53, 1. 63, 1. 79, 4. 14, G-1. 24, G-1. 35, G-4. 12).

5. Provision for the expression of student viewpoints (3. 6, G-3. 5).

6. The role of research in basic and advanced programs (1.8, G-1.4, G-2.6, G-4.5).

Accreditation in American higher education is a controversial and uncertain enterprise. Few of us are genuinely satisfied with its present results. This is especially true in teacher education where institutions of many kinds, sizes, resources, and quality are engaged in the preparation of teachers. In too many cases the emphasis for accreditation has been on whether a prescribed process was followed, not on how effective it was in preparing teachers, but much the same thing can be said about professional accreditation generally. Institutions clearly could meet all the formal requirements but be guilty of producing mediocre teachers under faculties hostile to teacher education and indifferent to the fact that many, if not most, of their students left their classes incompetent to teach their fields and insensitive to the needs of their future students. National associations can do much to remove from our campuses this indifference to commitments so vital to our society.

How can we involve scholars through university structures? Perhaps a more appropriate question would be: Is it possible? The disciplinary way of life that dominates our universities is essentially external to the university in many vital aspects. Yet numerous scholars are involved and many others will become involved if we encourage their commitment by appropriate decisions within university structures.

Clearly, if we wish scholars to make serious commitments of time and energy to cooperative ventures, our universities must join professional associations in creating environments favorable to scholars who can devote themselves to this important task. Professional loyalties, recognition, and grants often distract attention from the educational problems of our campuses and in our society. Our students, fortunately, have had the wisdom and the courage to remind us of the folly of continuing such a course.

Most observers would begin by emphasizing the role of university-wide committees, programs, and resources. I choose to begin at the other end of campus structures to insist that the emphasis must be in the departments.

This insistence comes not entirely from pragmatic experience but also from the understanding that it is at the departmental level that most of the vital decisions affecting a scholar's career are made: salaries, promotions, tenure, leaves, and all the other rewards indicating that his work is appreciated. The department is the nucleus of power in the university political community. To enlist its support is to possess a valuable ally.

With this recognition, our problems have only begun, however. Departmental policy reflects the views of its members; thus we confront the necessity of effecting changes in the scholar's self-image. This, of course, is not an impossible task, but it does remind us of the classic problems of moving the town cemetery.

Allocation of adequate resources will help. Thus university administrators and academic committees must encourage and reinforce departments at this point. Our hopes for significant involvement are misplaced unless top scholars become interested and stay interested. They are the professors whose assistance we must have. Recognized for their scholarship, they are natural leaders. Experienced in university decision making, they see their disciplines in perspective. Their leadership is crucial.

Once involved, scholars are apt to discover that matters of content soon become concerns about materials and methods as well. Whether we view teacher education as a separate discipline or as a catalyst fusing the disciplines, or even if we deny that disciplines really exist, the results at this point are the same. Departmental meetings can be rescued from procedural housekeeping and purely political discussions to levels of concerns that confront issues of educational objectives and teaching methods.

Disciplinary boundaries may be vague and nebulous, but departmental borders are not. Departments must become involved if we really hope to get the scholar genuinely interested and willing to see his colleagues in the schools of education as engaged in similar tasks. If it is difficult to achieve this, consider how much more strenuous it will be to get the scholar to see the work of the public school teacher of sufficient concern to merit attention and cooperation.

During recent years considerable emphasis on the university-wide committee on teacher education characterized both campus action and NCATE approval. While many such committees have proved valuable in stimulating inter-disciplinary cooperation in teacher education, it is clear that many others quickly became paper committees to be cited as evidence of cooperation whenever anyone raised embarrassing questions.

Joint appointments in education and in the teaching fields can be useful and have served many campuses well. Prevailing attitudes on most campuses, however, have all too often dictated that professors of education receive joint appointments in other departments while few economists, historians, political scientists, or scientists wish to take on the risk to status implied in joint appointments in the school of education.

Avenues for cooperation exist in the use of scholars in professional education as consultants on educational problems on the campus. Only last week, for example, one of the finest scholars in the field of higher education confided that he had never been consulted by his colleagues or by the administrators of his own university, and the tone of his voice indicated he thought this oversight to be a mistake. Certainly the pragmatic use of the findings of educational research could profitably be applied to most of our universities.

"College teachers," wrote Ordway Tead some years ago, "are not aware of their own myopia and unconcern about the total educational process and how it is to be conducted" (p. 211). Our graduate schools perpetuate this unconcern and annually send out the Ph. D. s as innocent of their own teaching functions as they are ignorant of the role they will play as teachers of teachers. Not until universities take steps to enlarge the world of their concerns will they become faculty members aware of the problems of the schools from which we draw our students and to which we send the teachers so inadvertantly trained. If we are lucky, one day our new college teachers will discover that the professors of education have no monopoly on "education" and are not the only teachers of teachers. That is the beginning of wisdom and each such discovery is a new hope for our schools. But we can no longer afford the luxury of such a capricious system or the wastefulness of such casual methods.

Traditional career patterns, as most of us have experienced them, offer little hope that we will involve sufficient numbers of scholars to turn the tide. New styles that offer academic prestige and more tangible rewards for those who undertake these new responsibilities are now required of us.

If our concern for the quality of academic content and the quality of life style existing in teacher education programs is as compelling as the crises we face, we will surely find ways to involve teaching field scholars in curriculum planning on a comprehensive scale, in in-service and continuing education programs, in practicum experiences, in supervising clinical experiences and in student teaching. On top of these, professional careers must also advance through involvement in joint committee assignments, conference and institute appearances, and through the publication of studies outside the strictly traditional limits of one's discipline.

All these comprise major shifts in our views about ourselves as scholars and about our roles in higher education. Short of some kind of academic Sadie Hawkins Day, it is difficult to imagine this happening very soon. Professional ambitions, disciplinary chauvinisms, and academic isolationism must not be permitted, however, to halt the gradual advance in the involvement of scholars we have witnessed in recent years. The involvement of professors from many academic disciplines in these educational enterprises surely carries with it something of the future of our democratic society.

References

Maucker, J. W. "Imperatives for Excellence in Teacher Education." In, A Decade of Thought on Teacher Education. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D. C., 1969.

Tead, Ordway. "Are College Teachers Interested in Education?" Journal of Higher Education, 33, 1962, p. 211.

THE FOURTH LEVEL OF INCOMPETENCE

The Fear of Hierarchy

"What would these scholars say
Should their Catullus pass their way?"

"They have turned, and say that I am dying
. . . Nothing
Save who I am. Not a note
Nor a word."

LeRoi Jones,
The Dead Lecturer

"Down these mean streets."

Piri Thomas

IV

Level four gives members of the conference their hardest time. Its main component is the shock of disbelief, or weariness, or anger, at how little the other three levels have led to. Its general operating symbol for higher education becomes a blanket -- smothering new shoots beneath, refusing to accommodate vital changes so hard won.

Here disciplinarians are called "those who lead American education by denying its existence." Or they are blamed for ignorance of the Mexican-American drop-out rate in San Antonio (86% by third grade). The constant theme, as one complains, is "self-flagellation."

The often strident tone rises from men who find a theater-of-the-absurd touch to the central question of the conference itself: how much, if any, interest should the disciplines take in teacher education? ("How much, if any, should a man on a powder keg regard the fuse burning toward him as a part of his concern? Lovely. I like it.")

Their exasperation grows from seeing the depth and range of this emergency go ungrasped. Their own partial successes and necessarily larger failures contrast irritably with tidier records, and the abrasiveness is heightened by having more made out of what they have done than is warranted, which further demeans the crisis of their engagement.

Two speakers stress how the corridors of schools look today, where the paint is peeling and passes are mandatory, where they have worked themselves, where the firebombs fall. Their words rush together and they shuffle their papers into some new, extemporized order, to stimulate more understanding in an audience which seems to stare rather blankly back -- as though this knuckle rapping, the right to this accusing stance, has not been properly negotiated for.

Two others wonder whether the whole strategy of involving the disciplines in teacher education through the professional associations is working at all. Where are the really powerful men? The department heads, perhaps. How many of them are at Grove Park? "In spite of monumental efforts, funding, and the work of a genius, we are still faced with basic questions."

Self-flagellation, all right, by believers.

REMARKS MADE AT THE GROVE PARK INSTITUTE

John B. Davis, Jr.

Superintendent of Schools
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Presented at the
Grove Park Institute of the Consortium of Professional Associations
for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs
Asheville, North Carolina
June 10-15, 1969

REMARKS MADE AT THE GROVE PARK INSTITUTE

Had I been here to have heard all speakers or to hear all that has been said in the discussion groups, I suspect that my speech could have been scratched with no loss. In such a circumstance I could have proved that Maine adage that you speak only when you can improve on silence. Silence gives the promise of thought, not the assurance. Thought is difficult, too difficult a task for many of us to engage in frequently.

The mark of an educated man also is to know when to be afraid, but I must be bold and ask at a conference considering the problem of teacher training, "Where are the classroom teachers?"

May I ask what constitutes your reality about a city public school system and teachers? Do you see it as Seymour Yesner saw it when he conferred last month in Massachusetts with members of the National Humanities Faculty? Mr. Yesner is the consultant in English for the Minneapolis Public Schools. I quote a portion of his report to me:

> I listened with increasing bewilderment to the Board members who see the schools as needing their efforts to revivify dead teachers and dead curricula. I don't think they got my message reiterated again and again about hostile teachers, tired teachers, frustrated teachers, anxious teachers, teachers who resent, justifiably, the esoteric and academic presumptions of many of us who are out of the classroom, safe from the discipline problems, from the harassment of the community and from the exhausting schedule of meetings and the very trying inter-personal relationships.

May I ask whether you have talked with a public school teacher recently? Have you talked with him in his school? Have you talked with him in his classroom? Have you observed the crowded corridors, the noisy corridors, the peeling paint, too little equipment, too few tools of instruction, too much tension, turmoil, turbulence? Did this, in any way, affect your thinking about continuity and continuing teacher training?

Did you sense the teacher's realities? Did you sense from him or her the school bureaucracy and its inability to recognize the welling up of ideas from local levels -- the great interest and great expectation and great hope dashed asunder by the bureaucracy which cannot respond to the thoughtfulness of teachers?

Was there a feeling of the commitment or the lack of commitment on the part of teacher colleagues? Did you sense the fatigue and the confinement of the day in a public high school? Did you sense the lack of support and the isolation of the classroom -- teacher from colleague?

Did you perhaps take advantage of the twenty-minute lunch period on the run? Disenchanted, disillusioned, depressed, discouraged students, did you see them? Did you meet those who can't read? For them school is not viewed as enhancing life's chances.

Did you discern a teacher's feeling of lack of outside support -- no great commitment from community for public education which some of us view as the balance wheel of the social machinery, an effective element if we are to salvage our cities and survive as a country.

On the other hand, if you visited a thoughtful teacher, in a different school, you may have sensed a ray of hope, the reconstruction possibilities for a school system, new organization patterns that are beginning to be acknowledged, better textbook materials, more paperbacks, better library service, and more help in difficult teaching areas from resource people -- the painful renaissance of the universities in terms of their commitment, their indispensable commitment to the importance of an open, free public school system, the introduction of flexible schedules which permits teachers to see better boys and girls in accordance with their peculiar and particular needs.

You may have sensed that there is, in the public schools, an increasing emphasis on learning--and a de-emphasis on teaching; this is a representation of the teacher's approaching the individual in order to perceive him as such, and then assigning the learning task specifically.

Indeed you may have sensed from some of these teachers or administrators that the public schools -- at least alert public schools and there are a number -- are beginning to see total community as the school room, no more a confinement to the traditional four walls. You may have heard from an administrator or teacher that some politician, that some artists, and some dancers are giving time and talent to the schools on regular bases and are coming to understand at first hand how it is that they can assist the education of boys and girls. These competent contributors at the same time also expand the horizon of the teacher, permitting him to sense the similarities in unlike things.

There is a great exciting world beyond the classroom and in Minneapolis some of these are part of the school experience, for there are now not only students in regular attendance at the Guthrie Repertory Theater, the Minneapolis Institute of Arts, at the Walker Museum, in a number of industries and businesses, but we have teachers from our faculty who are interning in these places for a semester, who are working day by day, shoulder to shoulder, with those who are performing, and whose work has been deemed excellent.

In Minneapolis there is a concept that Malcolm Moos, the president of the University, set forth some year-and-a-half ago on the occasion of his inauguration called "communiversity." I do not know if it is in the dictionary but it can at least be assigned a definition which is: "the university in the community." The public schools are beginning to feel the entry of some persons from university environs who for many years apparently had turned their backs to the problem and to the opportunity inherent in the central city schools.

Industry and business, economists, and many, many others have not just asked the question of what they might do to enhance the training of teachers or to improve educational materials, but they have put shoulder to the wheel and entered the arena and are regularly in the nonremunerative employ of the Minneapolis Public Schools.

The public school today represents a whole new game. It has its terrible minuses and its promising pluses. Very few outside the school understand the dynamics and too few thoughtful people are making the effort. A few talk about it.

A teacher in Minneapolis might well have asked you, "What is it that you scholars want? And why? What is your model of rejection and what is your model for adoption? Maybe you're just frustrated with your own role. What do teachers do that is bad, now that you've observed them? Dropouts and failures, you know, are not necessarily our fault or the fault of the public schools as institutions, but the absence of interest and usefulness in all kinds of institutions. Society has a responsibility. Is the university doing its job? Can you rearrange these values the community seems to have? Why not come and visit with us for a week? Our vacation variations are sufficient generally between university and college and public schools to permit it. And, oh yes, the absence of alternative institutions, referral institutions, for the exceptional boys and girls, the sick boys and girls, the psychologically upset boys and girls, the handicapped boys and girls, the disenchanted boys and girls, the discouraged boys and girls, the recalcitrant boys and girls -- the absence of these institutions makes it most difficult to respond to the particular needs of the students whom you see before me. No longer can it be said that a teacher is a teacher is a teacher, as a rose is a rose is a rose. It is not true, if it ever was."

Let me state it this way. We need a variety of teachers and a variety of services both public and private for an infinite variety of students who come from myriad circumstances and neighborhoods. We're beginning in the public schools truly to look at students as individuals, and we need many types of schools in which they may learn.

The public schools at the operating level need diverse adults and endless combinations of curricula to aid children. The adults include the guidance officer or counselor, include the thoughtful clergyman, include the intelligent citizen, include the social worker because we are now trying to serve our students and their families as never before. Society has imposed upon us, indeed the economy upon us the need to serve as alternatives to experience in the world of work. Slowly we are drawing the two worlds together with work experience programs, interns and apprentice training. The cloisters and the world outside are making new patterns of learning. Well, enough of that.

If you haven't been in a lively school this semester, you're out of touch.

Let's look at what's been said about the training of teachers and in-service. Frankly, I have a positive prejudice for Mr. Conant. In my judgment he made a good justification for in-service and he hit hard at the callousness of universities and colleges in chapter nine of his Education of American Teachers.

Among the things he said, and I shall move over all but one, but among the things he said was, "The average American college graduate is course bound." Among the many things our professors of arts and sciences have failed to accomplish is the inculcation of the idea that vast fields of knowledge and culture are wide open to any one who can read and will read.

The well-educated man in the future may be primarily a self-educated person which will call for the colleges and universities as well as the public schools to prepare him for critical use and evaluation of all the communications media.

Evidence accumulates that many, many people will have to perform tasks below their capabilities -- that frustration over psychic dislocations may well appear. There is need to see education as a vehicle for self-examination, self-knowledge, permitting one to find joy within himself.

I would assert that this statement is perhaps the cardinal point of education.

I suspect we will approach this goal faster if the scholars and the superintendents and the teachers pay some attention to the critics; for I believe reform at the university and the school level would bring to us teachers fit for the task of teaching and better educated for studentship.

And I distinguish here between studentship and scholarship believing that all who have had exposure to quality education can perform continually the task of studentship. Perhaps this is really what we are talking about. A studentship orientation produces a dissatisfaction if the individual is deprived of a flow of new knowledge and the chance to break away from the comfortable paths of habit.

Teaching as a Subversive Activity is a new book which I have not read; I must admit that even out in Minnesota one is dependent on the New York Times. On Sunday, May 11, the review of Peter Schrag, one of the great critics on American education and American society, appeared. I read a part of it because I believe that it is appropriate to public schools, but I think it does not exclude the college or the university. Now obviously there is much that makes this impossible. It's too threatening, it's too unwelcome, but let me read it anyway:

> It's become fashionable in American schools to pay lip service to "critical thinking," "individualized instruction," and to a collection of other noble objectives pedagogically associated with intellectual and personal independence. Most schools, of course, have never functioned that way; most, indeed, are designed to discourage independence, to teach acquiescence and to kill curiousity. What they do teach are ways of conning teachers, of beating the system, and of achieving grades and credits; most of them, in other words, teach contempt for the things they profess as their highest ideals.

Teaching as a Subversive Activity argues that the schools ought to practice what they sometimes profess: that they should teach "the art and science of asking questions," and that such questions have to deal with things that matter to students, not with canned and predigested subjects presented for regurgitation on tests and papers. Real discourse, therefore, begins with such questions as "What worries you most?" and "What bothers you most about adults?"

The book argues that no one trained to the false security of the traditional classroom can survive in an age of cataclysmic change, and that only a "new education" fostering an "inquiring, flexible, creative, innovative, tolerant liberal personality who can face uncertainty and ambiguity" makes any sense. Thus the book strongly advocates what is sometimes called "inquiry learning."

The book states that the only things people really learn are those that they learn for themselves because they seem to be worth learning.

Well, I could go on but I think the point is made that obviously we do not do this. But this, it seems to me, would have the effect of producing teachers for our classrooms and students in our public schools more equipped and more attuned to being certain that there was a continuum, that there was a continuity, and that there was a sequential development of information that was conveyed to them and there would be a questing and insistence that this type of instruction was pervasive throughout the system. Such a system presumes communication.

Gilbert Highet, describing the University of Paris in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, tells of the perpetual contest between the young and the bold, and the mature and the experienced that was a representation of a period in time when the university professors submitted themselves to the interrogation of the students. This is too often missing in contemporary education.

And John Ciardi praised the "go-to-class, hang-around, talk-to-students" kind of professor probably because he felt the student vision was so shattered by the realities of the monolithic faculty club, the comfortable home, and the out-of-town consultancy or conference.

Lectures are for information -- discussion for producing thought.

Bertrand Russell says that we view thought as subversive when actually it is the great glory of man. I ask you as we look at the current scene, where are the scholars and the critics in America in proportion to the population? Where is the continuation of studentship? Why is there no more carry-over of study and evaluation into the world after four years of college? Why don't we have more graduates who never feel satisfied with things as they are? We require continuing education of the public school teacher for a number of reasons, but there is a presumption that better training and more alertness and more knowledge gives better teaching and, hence, more productivity.

I once argued that we had to recover what the colleges had done badly, and that the public schools really had been prostituted by the training institutions where teachers had been produced. I now know that that isn't true and it's an unfair statement. Nonetheless, I think it may have been some years ago. For, why in-service?

First, there is a knowledge gap. We add so quickly to the already existing bodies of fact that there must be some way to develop and to insure that teachers stay abreast of latest developments.

Second, the intellectual gap or nondepth in the area of subject matters. Teachers begin to see quickly when they teach that they could benefit from added course material to broaden their understanding. Third, there is a lack of knowledge of child development. Teachers find it necessary to make up for poor training in areas of physical, psychological, and cognitive growth of children.

There is a human relations gap. Children need better sociological background in areas of race and community, not only to gain an understanding of the diversity of students but also to increase their own humanity. How do we lead children through a process of learning?

And there is a lack of knowledge about the technological hardware -- from the talking typewriters to the tape recorders, and to the computers, and the language lab, and the overhead projector.

There is a lack of knowledge of pertinent educational research and development which relates both to subject matter areas or to the broad expanse of complex school and community problems and, of course, related to this is a question of schools filtering out that which has validity and that which is speculative.

One assumes, although it may be an inaccurate assumption, that the university specialist does find it possible to read, to reflect, and to carry on his research, but it is a rare elementary or secondary teacher who can find time to do likewise. He probably spends nearly the entire school day in direct contact with students -- an exhausting day. In addition he has many other obligations to satisfy, some vital and some trivial. Whether or not he changes, however, the subject he teaches does change. We're told by Raymond Reynold, professor of English at Georgetown, that within five to ten years after graduation, half of what one teaches was not taught to him in college.

In some fields new developments come so fast that in the time it takes to write a book, the author wants to rewrite it.

One would hope that in the college the prospective teacher has been taught the ways of accomplishing and integrating the new knowledge into the old.

No matter how excellent was the teacher's preservice education, he cannot expect to ramain competent unless he keeps abreast of new knowledge in the field. The problem is compounded by the fact that the undergraduate education itself of many teachers was not entirely satisfactory.

How does the University explain away the fact that some social science teachers have had no course in sociology, no course in economics, or geography, or social psychology or anthropology?

In the city of Minneapolis we have a mighty state university with highly qualified scholars of every discipline, but we do not seem to benefit from this great resource as we should. We do not ignore that institution, to be sure; nor do they ignore us.

But we lack mechanisms at the local district level for insuring a continuous engagement between those persons on the campus who are in the forefront of scholarly inquiry and the teachers in our schools whose task it is to communicate the essence of a discipline to growing minds.

One factor which makes communication difficult between scholars and educators is the relatively specialized approach of the one, compared with the relatively generalized view of the other.

I should like to share with you this memo from the director of our social science division, Robert Beery:

> The central focus of our recent in-service has been to prepare teachers for dealing with scholarly and socially significant topics that have not been adequately included in the social studies curriculum. There are two related problems here: teacher conceptual and content background and teacher translation of new content into classroom learning experiences for youngsters.
>
> The traditional approach has been to assume that lectures by academicians will give background to the teacher and the professional teacher will naturally proceed to implement new content in his instruction. However, recent experience has shown that the translation phase is frequently an impossible hurdle for the busy teacher. This is particularly true where skills and methods of the disciplines are to be taught as components of scholarly inquiry, resulting in active student structuring of a conceptual framework from the disciplines.

We have used University economists to teach our courses on principles of economics, money and banking, economic history of the U. S., etc. Teachers evaluate these courses as highly relevant to their needs in the classroom. Out of a concern for translation, we in Minneapolis have required teachers in the economics of poverty course to write teaching-learning materials to develop a basic concept or topic related to their study of poverty. Such a project actively involves them in thinking about problems of translation while taking the course. Products tend to be of high quality and have resulted in teacher-prepared materials which demonstrate their grasp of content and their understanding of complex problems of teaching for multiple objectives. These plans are now being collected, evaluated, and edited for use by many teachers.

Our approach to in-service education for the use of High School Geography Project materials represents similar efforts to meet hurdles to classroom implementation. Detailed student and teacher materials from this project incorporate content organization and teaching approaches not familiar to the average teacher. An in-service course focusing on the teaching of the materials was conducted in the fall. Student materials were used by teacher-participants much as students would use them. This was followed by a lecture series organized by the geography department at the University of Minnesota. Specialists elaborated on their fields as they pertained to the project materials. Participants developed reading and visual materials to extend or modify the original project materials.

This use of scholars in a lecture series with built-in follow-up in terms of teaching considerations has also been used in two series on minority studies: "The Indian's America" and "The Black Man in America." These series included local and national social scientists who provided ideas from their particular scholarly perspectives. Both series were organized by the University of Minnesota but the sessions relating to teaching were organized by the Minneapolis Public Schools in concert.

Two additional projects used in our schools focused on upgrading teacher performance as they are built into teacher plans and student resources. Neither project included specific in-service courses. The

Sociological Resources for the Social Studies project and the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project people felt that their initial work had indicated that student materials and teacher plans were more important than teacher course background in determining successful classroom use. Teacher responses to the use of the materials from these projects tend to support this conclusion. However, resource teachers were available to assist teachers as they discovered problems in their classrooms.

Our Carnegie program for the production of English teachers, which I shall pass over very quickly, calls for joint appointment and many, many universities and colleges have been very slow to recognize the excellence of their colleagues in the public schools and recognize the value in joint appointment.

We have five supervising teachers on 2/5 teaching load, 3/5 assigned to the Carnegie project. The Carnegie project has been significant and effective in the production of teachers, but I would guess that the significant factors we have discovered in this project are that the prospective English teacher is exposed early to the classroom, early given the chance to teach a unit, and early is in the ken of a thoughtfully selected public school teacher who is directly connected to the university.

The conclusions to be drawn include also the fact that more and more of the training of teachers must take place in the public schools where the students are and that training and contact should begin well in advance of the junior year.

The Minneapolis Public Schools also have moved wisely in the developing of guidelines for in-service training programs. Two-and-a-half years ago a committee taking its charge from the superintendent developed a guideline for acquiring credits and movement on the salary line. There is a presumption again here that better-trained teachers will be more productive and are worthy of being paid more. In its deliberations about professional growth for teachers, the committee went on record as favoring the elimination of the requirement for a Ph. D. and substituted instead 60 quarter credits beyond the Master's degree. The committee has adopted the broadest possible approach in defining college courses and if they are earned in an accredited college or university, they are satisfactory; and the committee believes further that for many teachers undergraduate courses are as valuable, if not more valuable, than graduate courses(and should be) and as a result are given full credit at any point on the salary schedule.

The committee suggested that if Minneapolis is to emphasize teacher training awards more strongly in its salary schedule, it should at the same time develop means to assist teachers to plan long-run schemes of professional development, schemes that bear close relationship to the work of the teacher in the classroom.

The individual teacher has the best knowledge of the type of courses he needs to improve himself professionally and to become more effective in the classroom and he should plan his own in-service program. This is now permitted, although we did build in the condition or warning phrase that it would probably be well for teachers to discuss their plans with their principals and/or their consultants before embarking. Many teachers are of course enrolled in universities and colleges but in a true sense the Minneapolis public school system is its own university, although we draw heavily on outside talent. We build our own courses, we draw our own faculty together, and we provide the opportunity for teachers to meet effectively the multiple needs of the variety of students that appear before them. We are at last beginning to listen to what teachers tell us.

As a final thought, let me suggest that to insure continuity and culmination in in-service training programs, we must assist each other in devising and inventing new organizational patterns for our schools. Contact with scholars calls for specialization. Good specialization calls for a differentiation of tasks. Differentiation of tasks means that there shall be a variety of people responsible for the education of groups of children. Leaders of teams may emerge. Leaders of teams who can set the pattern, who can loosen the rigidity of schedules, who can hold high standards of performance, who can permit the specialist roles to be exhibited -- psychologists, social workers, guidance officers, wise parents, teacher aides, and occasional clergy from the community to name a few are representations of the great consortiums that are needed in the Minneapolis public schools today to do the job that the boys and girls are deserving of if we are to spiral them out of their dilemma, insure against the perpetuation of generation after generation of ineffectiveness. The concept of the teacher as a director of learning with many professionals and paraprofessionals in a supportive role is coming into being. These are specific and supplemental ways by which our common goals can be reached.

There is a story out of New England. It's the story of a New England host who in traditional and, I guess, retiring fashion felt compelled to report to his guests as they sat down to dinner and the wine was poured, "It is only New York state wine, but you will enjoy its presumption."

I have to a degree been presumptuous -- that's easy. At the risk of compounding this presumption, let me ask, how long will the great academic communities remain silent even in the face of the fact that it has been said the children of the poor produce children of the poor who produce children of the poor and the children of the bigots produce children of the bigots that produce children of the bigots? How long will the great academic communities whose silence is astounding to many public school administrators -- how long will they tolerate a lesser model of excellence in the public schools that they would have their children attend? How long will they permit the training of teachers to be less than a total university responsibility at the undergraduate level?

How long will the academic communities look right over their adjacent schools and their ponderous problems and fail to recognize that the problem is there instead of losing themselves in the globalness of national conference and meeting?

Would it be wise for each of you to become immersed with a select group of colleagues in the problems of your local schools for two years, and then at the expiration to call a national conference, and report findings and the steps taken to bring remediation to an institution sadly in need of great competence and great support? This manifestation of interest from the scholarly community would seem a harbinger of better cumulation and continuity in the training and the retraining of America's teachers, a harbinger of better things for teaching as a great career.

WE ALREADY HAVE OUR HATS

Vernon Haubrich

Professor of Education
Educational Policy Studies Center
University of Wisconsin

Presented at the
Grove Park Institute of the Consortium of Professional Associations
for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs
Asheville, North Carolina
June 10-15, 1969

WE ALREADY HAVE OUR HATS

The Limitations of the Disciplines in the Education of Teachers

When one examines the response of the Boston matron to the request of her young niece to go shopping for new hats for the spring season, ("we already have our hats"), one is reminded of some issues which confront both those in the "disciplines" and those who can be called "educationists." I should like, first, to sketch these in broad outline; second, to describe the setting for these issues; and finally, to make some concrete suggestions for the further involvement of the disciplines in the work of educating teachers.

The first issue which confronts those who would venture more closely into the education of teachers can be put rather simply: The model and structure of the university to which the prospective teacher is subjected while in college is the very same model adopted by teacher educators, secondary schools, and increasingly, elementary schools. This model is based on the historic nineteenth and twentieth century German University and emphasizes specialization, graduate domination, departmentalization, the accounting system of grades, hours, and credits, and above all, a remoteness, an aloofness which permeates the entire structure under such names as "academic," "detached," "scholarship," or various combinations thereof. The structure and organization of higher education into this expressed form has affected the "nondiscipline" areas of study such as law, education, social work, and the like. There has been a general emulation of the model to such an extent that teacher educators per se (the educationists) often never get near a public school, see teaching or learning, or have much to do with preparing teachers. The research bug has bit one and all.

The second major issue which one confronts in examining the limitations of the disciplines (and those who imitate the graduate school, research orientation of those disciplines) in the education of teachers is the enormous social distance between the faculties of the university and the staffs of elementary and secondary schools. Before one thinks this sort of role-identity problem is unique to the university-public school issue, let me assure you that the same problem exists between the secondary school on the one hand and the elementary school on the other. This form of social distance is often exacerbated by the physical distance of the university from the public schools, the previously-noted interest and reward pattern established in each of the structures, and the career goals of the teacher versus those of the professor. With these two critical issues setting the parameters of my discussion, I should like to describe the way in which these issues have developed by noting some basic considerations and assumptions.

First, it is necessary to note that schools or colleges have become bureaucratic and that the scale of these bureaucracies has steadily increased over the past thirty or forty years. In this situation almost classic lines of bureaucratic development have taken place in which a system of roles graded by authority with fixed jurisdictional areas regulated by rules and/or laws.

Second, individual personality is formed by institutional bureaucracies and certain personality types tend to predominate in the staffing of these bureaucracies (Presthus, 1962). Personality characteristics which are important to individual success in bureaucracy are loyalty, conviviality and dependency. The seniority factor is crucial in bureaucratic success, but the more senior the bureaucrat the more he will exhibit those personality characteristics which cause acceptance in the structure.

Third, the characteristics of bureaucracies -- the size of organization; specialization of function; hierarchical ordering of roles, tasks, and rewards; status based on seniority and administrative ability rather than on specialist skills; control of the system by a few; impersonality in organizational thrust; and finally, a deference to authority are apt to be characteristics of large school systems, teachers and administrators, professors and deans.

The gathering of disciplinarians -- representing controlling figures in the disciplines curriculum, administration, writing, teaching, and supervising -- represents a virtual penultimate of the upwardly mobile members of the education bureaucracy. To have such a group reflect on their own behavior, the manner in which they make decisions, the goals they have for children, youth, prospective and experienced and inexperienced teachers, would be quite an achievement in that most of their training in the disciplines has taught them not to reflect at all.

The System of Education

Much of the mythology surrounding teaching, schooling, and the educative process comes about because the practitioners in the field, teachers, and administrators, need protection from the incursions of researchers and others who would look at the system and its results in a more or less objective fashion (Miles, Chap. 25). Consequently, we are constantly faced with some propositions to which the practitioners and the general public pay homage. Among these are: the disciplines provide a major source of thought which is the same in all places, colleges and classrooms; the system of education is local in nature with controls at the local community level; class size is critical to the learning process; teachers are independent professionals providing a professional service in the classroom; teaching can never be measured because we can never agree on basic terms. These and other mythologies cause immense difficulties when one attempts to look at the manner in which professionals can be prepared and the critical entry points in the system.

In considering the nature of the educational system, some writers (Wayland, pp. 587-613) have concluded that we have, de facto, a national system of education. The evidence which one can muster for this conclusion centers on four basic, though indirect, indices for a national system. These are:

1. There exists a national recruitment of teachers.
2. Students move from school to school system with little difficulty.
3. Instructional materials enjoy a national market.
4. There is, in effect, a national examination system (Wayland, pp. 599-602).

What we are faced with at the start of our analysis is a loose confederation of 37,025 school districts and 2,200 colleges with little difference between them in organization, teaching, curriculum, or means of separation and promotion. The existence of a large-scale organization, serviced by supporting and ancillary systems (Wayland, pp. 595-596), indicates that the prospect of local attempts at innovation and change will suffer at the hands of a superbly functioning interlocking series of schools, the top of which is the graduate department of the modern university.

This last point is critical, for it is the conclusion of an examination of the school system as a basically hierarchical structure, with great power, influence, and decision making at the top. The selectivity, recruitment, and efficiency which are built into any bureaucratic structure are also part of the system of education where the interests of the higher group of educators are serviced by those immediately below. Educators in public schools have had training in the college and, often, in the graduate department of the university. The interpenetration of staff, function, and especially, control over entrance to the graduate departments of a university creates a self-contained and self-perpetuating system. The system is supported by a series of ancillary structures and relates to the testing, the time and the curriculum regularity in the system as a whole.

What we see in this brief analysis is a view of the school system which is clearly bureaucratic in the same sense as defined by Max Weber in 1922. Specialization of function, limited role definition and an interdependence of various substructures characterizes the system of schooling in the United States. One additional factor which causes both a difficulty and a direction should be noted. The enormous turnover of teachers[1] increases the regularity and the rigidity of curriculum, procedures, and induction techniques. The stability which is thereby required (because innovation and change requires attention, follow through and a "product champion"; Miles, Chap. 25) indicates, at least in part, the aim which teacher education and the disciplines might take. Given the tentative nature of commitment on the part of the functionaries at the lower level (e.g., teachers) any developmental procedures should look to the committed professionals in the school system, especially those with supervisory, administrative, or regulatory duties.

One additional finding regarding the "system" of education. City school systems and colleges seem to develop a sense of climate which is unique to each city or place.[2] Boston sets forth, based on a unique history and tradition, one kind of organizational climate while New York entertains another. A recent study of the New York system (Gittell) -- and there is substantial evidence to adduce that this evidence is not unique to New York City -- indicates the enormous power wielded by the "corps of supervisory employees at the headquarters building." The crucial nature of the power was in the area of budget and curriculum but included other areas of school operation as well.

Again, this study reinforces the point that school systems and colleges tend to generate their own bureaucracy, tend to limit the nature and rate of change within the system, tend to function with their ancillary structures in a national system of education, and tend to a uniformity of response so as to protect those within the system from those without.

What we have then in this system of education is:

1. A hierarchical system with much power above the level of teaching, but centered most probably on the middle level functionaries;
2. An interlock between each level of education, with the graduate school as the capstone of the system (Wayland);
3. A bureaucratic system in which role definition and specialization of purpose tends to place the teacher in the role of functionary rather than autonomous professional;

4. A _de facto_ national system of education which is geared to several functions and which is supported by a formal system as well as complementary and independent ancillary structures related to testing, accreditation and promotion to higher levels; and

5. The internal structure of each subunit has two aspects which tend to prevent change: first, each subunit is insulated and isolated from other subunits; and second, policy consultants and benefits are usually autonomous within each subunit.

What emerges from the previous consideration of the system of education in the United States is that teacher education, along with the disciplines, like the system of public schools, has an enormous capacity to absorb change and not change at all. A review of programs related to the preparation of teachers indicates that the apparent philosophical differences between one program or another are but shadows in the illusory series of debates held at conventions and in classrooms.

The capacity of the system to adopt, modify, accommodate to, and make regular hundreds of program changes indicates the enormous political power which this informal system can exert. It takes virtually anyone into camp and has, as a consequence, more camp followers than troops. The endless arguments of teacher educators and disciplinarians as to the reliability of one program as opposed to another has been so much psychological flugg. The major benefit of this type of argument is that if someone does come along to challenge the issue of what has been going on in the field of higher education, the professor or administrator who is on his toes can point with some degree of pride to the unique program at Oshkosk or Paducah or Harvard which is exactly what the critic wishes to see. When the teacher education program of the nation is everything, it quickly becomes nothing.

Consequently, the modern university with its research orientation and domination by graduate school found a place for the preparation of teachers, administrators and other related personnel. The modern university, including as it now does the schools and colleges of education, continues to have the broadest possible conception of its role along with the former normal schools turned state colleges. This expansiveness of effort and interest is both a tribute to those involved in the effort as well as a caution for those who wish to enter the murky waters of teacher education.

A Venture into Organizational Systems

Given the proposition that the educational system is hierarchical in nature with control of the system at the top, and that it corresponds to a highly organized bureaucratic structure, it is important to examine some of the general principles of organizational change that have come about in recent years. An underlying principle characterizing organizational change is that it occurs infrequently. There is no reason at this time to suppose that the educational system is any different nor that the relative difficulty of affecting change is any less. However, as some writers have noted (Griffiths), change sometimes does occur within organizational structures and that from these limited number of occurrences some tentative generalizations have come about. Some of these generalizations refer to the nature of change vis-á-vis the many participants in the system. Others refer to the changes that can be expected within the administrative structure of an organization.

There are some social psychological principles which seem to operate when organizational change does occur and it might be well for us to spell these out at this time. First, the whole notion of expectations of individuals within an organizational pattern are absolutely critical to the question of whether change occurs or whether it doesn't. Since unilateral power and the notion of hierarchical ordering underlies the educational system, the expectations of the person directly above the teacher and professor are far more important in creating change than those below the teacher and professor, e.g., their students. The same principle would hold as one moves up the organizational ladder in schools, ending in the graduate school.

Second, changes which can be recorded when the individual is out of his own organizational situation (such as summer programs in college classes, Saturday morning programs in extension centers, evening session lectures, etc.) do not have any long-term impact when the individual returns to the organizational setting. Change off the job has far less force than changes which occur in situ. The best place to involve the disciplines is in the context of the public school or the arena of the community, especially in modifying the traditional roles which the disciplines have played.

Third, a unique and peculiar relationship exists between conditions which facilitate change and the personality structure of teachers and/or administrators who are willing to accept the change. This syndrome, which includes personal characteristics on the part of the school functionary, as well as educational programs developed within the school, is critical to the bet one chooses to make with money. You do not improve the quality of educational change nor its rate by going to school personnel or school situations which are most likely to resist educational re-examinations.

Fourth, the improvement of school functionaries in a vertical pattern of training, which includes school personnel drawn from the lowest echelon, such as teacher aides, to the highest, such as assistant superintendents and superintendents, would prove more feasible vis-á-vis change than grouping individuals by role or function. In a similar situation linkages between college and public school personnel would prove more efficacious than keeping them separate.

Fifth, programs of change involving segments of the educational systems must have continuing feedback to controlling power forces above. Without adequate feedback and evaluation, educational organizations tend to stress cost reduction (Mann; Miles, Chap. 25); consequently, programs involving teachers, administrators, or related educational personnel must set up, in advance, an adequate system of information feedback.

Sixth, the changes contemplated by an educational system or by those outside the system must be capable of institutionalization. Essentially, the idea to be introduced cannot be so different from present practices so as to cause puzzlement or threat to the mind of the practitioners or functionaries. The person who wishes to introduce change in an educational system must first go along with the system to get his idea into practice. For the innovation or the change to become part of the school system should be the objective of any group wishing to introduce varying procedures into that system.

Seventh, and last, what seems to come through the haze on the issue of an educational and organizational bureaucracy is that if you want the change to grow and become a part of the organization itself, then something more than ideology must come into play -- somebody has got to be in charge.

What seems to come through on the social-psychological end of the matter is that change from the bottom is virtually impossible in the educational system and that the independence of subsystems within the organization isolates and insulates each group from one another. Clearly, the questions that the disciplines face in trying to create organizational and bureaucratic change are questions having to do with linking the functionaries (including teachers, professors, and administrators); providing for communication between those at the top and at the bottom; engaging in programmatic activities which are centered in the situation where the functionaries are at work; and lastly, selecting school systems, colleges, and individuals who seem to have a propensity for testing out new ideas.

In the light of these aspects of bureaucratic and administrative change, any consideration of power in teacher education must include, at the same time, a reference to the context of higher education in which teacher education finds itself. If one wishes to assess the possibilities and potentialities of funding experimental programs in teacher education and the disciplines, the critical questions will center on the students as potential, the college as unique and the program as organic to both students and college. Large-scale intrusions into training programs cannot be based on a single model of teacher education but must rather turn to the kinds of advantages which colleges in individual contexts seem to offer.

This examination could profit from the growing body of material which reviews and locates the critical linchpins in the bureaucratic structure of schools and colleges. It is most important to those responsible for the assessment of power in schools and colleges to maintain a tendency to partialize the problems of schools and colleges, for the very size of the educational establishment has provided for those who sit in positions of responsibility a convenient haze and smog with which to confuse, parry, and obfuscate responsible criticism of the establishment.

Directions and Priorities

It is possible to review the matter of educational system and its attendent problems, explicate the research on organizational and bureaucratic change, look to some examples of this change with large-scale organizations in the society, and then quit. The task of the "here and now" requires that two questions be reviewed and kept in mind. First, there has to be some attention to the question of *the direction of professional training* and to its component parts; and second, there must be attention to *the issue of priority* in servicing the educational system with a view related to professional development. Let us go to the first question and attempt to look at a series of propositions which are related to the development of the professional teacher and administrator.

The professional in the educational system serves the unique function of spending a working life serving, in a more or less direct fashion, the welfare of others. This service comes about because the clientele of the professional perceives the service as necessary and essential. Additionally, the professional in the field of education should have one of the characteristics of the other helping professions, which is to engage in a two-way communication with their clientele. In the educational transaction the client (the student) responds not in terms of something that is done to him, but in terms of what the experiences in school mean to him.

The development of the professional teacher and administrator, both of whom are service functionaries to children and youth, begins, ends, and is passed on in the degree to which they feel an assuredness and security about the tasks they are expected to perform.

The question of analyzing the tasks which the professional educator is expected to perform centers on two crucial concerns: first, what the educational enterprise should be about; and second, how the specific knowledge and skills of teachers and administrators can be translated so as to cause a school system to operate effectively with the above goals in mind. Let us turn to these two elements which would bring us full circle in our analysis.

If schools are meant, using Melvin Tumin's language, for children, for their development, for their growth, and for their pleasure, and if secondly, this same development of children takes place in transactions between the student and the teacher, then it follows that if children fail to develop to their potential, the shortcomings or errors are to be sought in the structure of the school and college system, not in the innards of the children.

If one supplements the above proposition to the extent that a child takes from schooling that which is inherently valuable to him, and if one adds that there is no conceivable justification for a democratic society preferring the education of some children over others, then it does follow that every child has a full claim on the facilities and rewards of the school.

The direction of professional development of both teachers and administrators could center on the basic proposition of the inherent worth of individual differences -- not their denigration or elimination. The flexible use of teacher and administrative time, the full development of individual potential, and the classroom setting as diagnostic rather than bureaucratic are but some of the goals which could be pursued by teachers, supervisors, and administrators.

The consequences of such a series of simple propositions related to the educational development of children would mean that the professionals' knowledge, skill, and attitudes with respect to schooling (learning and teaching) would mean something other than the present bureaucratic stance. In effect, what is being postulated at this point is that the teacher's knowledge and his capacity to use that knowledge in a professional setting are not well served by the present hierarchical structure of the educational system and by the narrow range of subject matter which the teacher studies in that system.

Let me give an example. Teachers who have received the standard undergraduate curriculum (80% liberal arts and 20% professional education) view their assuredness, their teaching, and their role in the school system as that of a middle-level functionary operating to create skills in children which will enable the child to be successful at the next highest level of specialization. In essence, the teacher's function is that of a gatekeeper.

Reinforcing the teacher's concept of the classroom is the context in which he receives his advance graduate instruction. In most cases an experienced teacher takes courses at a college or university and these courses are defined by professors, approved by departments, and serve the same kind of gatekeeper function. The courses are organized in a time-honored fashion, which includes lectures, quizzes, and research papers. The teachers and administrators who come to the course are presented with a view of knowledge which is increasingly specialized and, in many cases, not relevant to the classroom situation at all. Knowledgeable professors and less knowledgeable students come together -- one to give, the other to receive. The central assumption is that what the university offers will improve the teacher and his teaching. What is probably the case is that the teachers and administrators have conformed to the higher forms of gatekeeping, while the critical issue of learning and teaching and other related problems rarely comes to the surface.

By setting the education of teachers and administrators in the structure of college and university courses, rather than in the situation where teachers and administrators find their work, we engage in a contradiction of the evidence previously cited. The linkage between the system of public education and the system of higher education is not readily apparent, except on the terms of the latter.

In summary, let me suggest that if schools are to be related to the educational development of children and if that same development is to serve other than a gatekeeper and bureaucratic function, then the education of professionals will require a different order and conception of what we presently find.

Suggestions and Possibilities

Let us take a moment to review the fundamental position taken here before going on to suggestions and possibilities for those in the disciplines and teacher education.

The central issue which we considered at the beginning of the discussion related to the model-structure of the university (as exemplified by graduate school prestige and domination, overspecialization, emphasis on research, and the credit-course-grading pattern) as the express model-structure which the public school teacher has to imitate and emulate. The university may call on public school teachers and administrators to do something different, but until the university is willing to change its own mode of operations, system of prestige and rewards, and make internal changes from the graduate school to the freshmen class, all we will have is exhortation and no example.

Consequently, those in the disciplines will have to confront the central limitation which they have, willy-nilly, imposed on themselves, namely, that the bureaucratic and socialized set in which they find themselves has managed to limit the participation of disciplinarians in the effective education and re-education of teachers. In confronting their basic dilemma the only hope is participatory behavior by risk-taking professors, associations, colleges and public schools, acting on some tentative generalizations as to the manner and means of effecting this change.

To direct undergraduate and graduate schooling to the needs of teacher education is indeed a momentous event and could not be accomplished all at once.

Consequently, the suggestions made here are based on the previous discussion and are, hopefully, related to the specific issue of involvement by the disciplines in teacher education. These suggestions must be regarded as tentative, subject to review and as a basis for discussion.

First, issues within the college and university:

1. Attention must be given within each of the disciplines as to its model and image and reception by students, many of whom are in the process of becoming teachers. The question of the involvement of each of the disciplines with the issue of teaching (qua teaching), the nature of the subject matters taught, the relevance of these to students who may become teachers, the connections with other departments, and the involvement of people from the disciplines with the public schools as aides, tutors, and teachers (as well as researchers), are but some of the human issues each discipline must confront. The actual involvement in public schools would gain for the disciplines the kind of validity and authenticity one needs when speaking of the realities in schools. The concept and sanctity of the grading pattern, 3-credit courses and the overly specialized subject matters which are often buttressed by compulsory attendance regulations are internal matters which affect the disposition, outlook, and attitude of would-be teachers. Ernst Becker (in press) has suggested that eliminating

compulsory attendance and instituting a pass and no-pass system would create a revolution in higher education. No longer would specialized courses and poor teaching be something students would have to put up with. Stenographers could take notes of dry and irrelevant lectures for distribution to students. No longer would the asinine demarcations (A+, A, A-, B+, B, B-, etc.) be used to intimidate and compel.

2. The system of prestige and rewards must be shifted by exemplary programs some of which originate in the graduate school. Such graduate programs would involve an increased emphasis on service and connection to community by emphasizing internships carrying large blocks of credit; through a reduction in formal courses and an increase in individual search and study between and among departments; and investigations representing new and exciting endeavors in cities, rural areas, among the disadvantaged having an action basis as well as a research orientation. Given the leadership and example of some leading graduate departments, undergraduate instruction could and would follow suit.

Second, with respect to connections with educationists, public school teachers and administrators, and the community at large:

1. The disciplines must design programs which call for a longer participation with educationists, teachers, and administrators in the situational context of the public school. In situ should be the new place where the disciplinarians and the educationists face the difficult realities of subject matter, methodology, pedagogy, teaching and learning. Summers are not enough for this purpose; yearlong connections are needed.

2. Programs which involve the widest, as opposed to the narrowest, array of concerns for a program should be encouraged by college, state and federal funding agencies. A vertical context for program development would include community representatives, teachers, teacher aides, administrators, school board members, members of related and relevant disciplines from the college and representatives from the graduate school and/or central administration. A program which is defined horizontally where only professors talk to professors, teachers to teachers, etc., will have far less force than a program which includes the views, contributions and problems of all concerned.

3. The disciplines must begin to think about the committed professional as the object of their attention, instead of calling for better people to enter teaching. To call for the best to enter teaching just is not possible, given the system of rewards which public school teaching affords. What disciplinarians, educationists and others must

realize is that the person who sticks in the classroom, becomes a principal, runs the school, in short, is exactly the key figure all of us must think about, design programs around and listen to. It is to this committed professional, who has the outlook and influence of the established bureaucracy, that the university must make its major contribution. The links to what actually happens in schools are not to be found in the magic of interdisciplinary courses, new programs exclusively at the college, or calls for the most intelligent to enter teaching. The keys to what contributions the university can make are to be found among those who control what happens -- the careerists in public education.

In conclusion, in the judgment of this writer, we are long overdue for a critical re-education of the professional staff of school systems and the total university who must teach them. This paper proposes that the direction of any discussion of programmatic development in professional preparation and training provide school and university personnel with more vision than once they had as well as more insight into the system they control.

The issue which faces the present establishment is whether or not they perceive the gap which exists between the legitimate demands from areas of the society for redress of educational disenfranchisement and the state of present programs in education, teacher education, and schooling. Within this general problem, what is probably critical is the nature of the person who must carry forward the task of restructuring, reorganizing, and retraining the members of the teaching profession.

The difficulty of the task is awesome, but the rewards great. For those who wish to undertake such a work, the words of President Kennedy may have some meaning. In speaking to those who must actually do the work and undertake the changes he said,

> The credit belongs to the man who actually is in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood . . . who knows the great enthusiasms, the great devotions; who spends himself in a worthy cause, who at the best knows at the end the triumph of high achievement, and if he fails, at least fails while daring greatly, so that his place shall never be with those timid souls who know neither victory nor defeat.

References

Becker, E. "The crisis of the university." In, Bureaucracy, Freedom, and Schooling. New York: ASCD, in press.

Gittell, M. Participants and Participation: A Study of School Policy in New York City. New York: The Center for Urban Education, 1967.

Griffiths, D. E. "Administrative theory and change in organizations." In M. Miles (Ed.), Innovation in Education. New York: Bureau of Publication, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Mann, F. C. "Styling and Creating Change." In, W. G. Bennis, Beene, and Chin (Eds.), The Planning of Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964.

Miles, M. (Ed.) Innovation in Education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Presthus, R. The Organizational Society. New York: Knopf, 1962.

Tumin, M. "Teaching in America." Speech presented to the National Committee for Support of the Public Schools, Fifth Annual Conference, Washington, D. C.

Wayland, S. R. "Structural Features of American Education as Basic Factors in Innovation." In M. Miles (Ed.), Innovation in Education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Footnotes

[1] No more than 2 of 5 teachers who are prepared to teach are teaching after five years.

[2] The work of Alan Rosenthal, Rutgers University, is instructive on this point.

THE FIFTH LEVEL OF INCOMPETENCE

Fear of the Past

"I am ashamed before the darkness . . .
I am ashamed before that standing within
me which speaks with me . . ."

Torlino

"Accurate scholarship can
Unearth the whole offence
From Luther until now
That has driven a culture mad,
Find what occurred at Linz
What huge image made
A psychopathic god:
I and the public know
What all school children know
Those to whom evil is done
Do evil in return."

W. H. Auden

V

The highest level of incompetence expressed at Grove Park causes some the most resentment and others the tribute of tears. It is at least powerful enough to draw all the strikes at platform histrionics which follow for the rest of the week. "Yes, I was just as moved as everybody else in the room," one says. "But then I went upstairs and had a nap. When I woke up afterwards, I began to wonder: Why all this concern for minority mythology? What about Wasp mythology? Frankly, I'm more interested in that."

Second thoughts abound. "Getting up there and coughing into the microphone. Garbo couldn't have done it better. A little mild pneumonia, after moving furniture around in a ghetto school -- Holy Cow." "He's left himself open on that stuff about humanism. I doubt if it will stand up." "What he said about managers just doesn't wash."

Any academician worth his course of study has honed reflexes fine enough to distinguish his point of view from any other, at the drop of any hat, in any hall. What does keep the Laurel Room so quiet, to make the coughing stand out? Where does the double decibel count come from in the applause afterwards?

From more than willingness to meet high defeat. From more than historical justification of the scholar's attention to the whole educational scale. From more than the ethic of cultural pluralism, as a rectification of past and prevention of future injustice.

From the gently implied belief that all the towering wrongs, old and new, have not yet buried man's capacity to see and to correct.

HUMANISM, SOCIETY, AND THE EDUCATION OF TEACHERS

Paul A. Olson

Foundation Professor of English
Director, University of Nebraska Tri-University Project
Co-Director, Nebraska Curriculum Development Center

Presented at the
Grove Park Institute of the Consortium of Professional Associations
for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs
Asheville, North Carolina
June 10-15, 1969

HUMANISM, SOCIETY, AND THE EDUCATION OF TEACHERS

I should say that before I was either a student of elementary education or a student of the English curriculum, I was a medievalist. I continue to work as a medievalist; I teach graduate students and direct dissertations. I write in my area of specialization. I speak to you as representatives of the scholarly and professional societies out of a concern with the role of the scholar in a difficult educational universe. I speak on the basis of about seven years of some excitement and some disappointment. (I should say that if I'm incoherent this morning, it is because I have been trying to set some old furniture in a school which we work in in a ghetto in Lincoln, and it took me most of the weekend. As a consequence, I've got a sort of mild pneumonia which I'm fighting.)

The purpose behind my consenting to give this speech has to do with my conception of the function of the scholar -- the function of the humanist -- in our world and my obsession with the extent to which the scholar's role has been perverted by developments in the last few centuries. Those of us who are here probably think of ourselves as here on a side-road; we think of our concern for the schools as a momentary or long-term diversion accessory to our primary concerns as scholars and graduate advisors and teachers. It is my contention that this is precisely the reverse of what should be our conception of our role. The fact that we think of the schools as a secondary concern represents a deviation from an ancient humanistic conception of the functions of scholarship.[1]

Our concern for the schools ought to be more intense than our concern for graduate scholarship *per se*; the schools ought to matter more in our value system than graduate teaching. The schools are the chief vehicle through which a civilization communicates the self-conscious part of its system of values; they are the chief vehicle through which we communicate our sense of what a civilization ought to be. If we are concerned for the quality of civilized life, we are concerned for the quality of the schools which we create. By the humanist tradition, I mean that tradition which can be seen as originating with John of Salisbury and the schools of the twelfth century (particularly Chartres and Orleans), as continuing with Petrarch and Boccaccio in the fourteenth century, and perhaps as reaching its culmination in the Florentine Platonic Academy and the French academies of the sixteenth century. That humanist tradition has two streams as I see it. The one was a stream which fed the sense of common humanity reaching across culture and culture, civilization and civilization, by forwarding a conception of all men as citizens, potential citizens, of a kind of ideal Rome -- members of a common empire, an empire which we, as twentieth century men, can hardly imagine in its medieval and Renaissance imaginative form. The second fork of the humanistic stream fed the sense of man's common "humanity" by insisting that man's imaginative creations in any culture rehearse the values for which men live, that good is to be found in the myths of many cultures, and that the properly educated man lives at the same time in a variety of cultures (Boulding's "partially alienated man"). Such a conception of humanism and of the humanistic scholar's role insisted that the humanistic scholar is concerned with the sense of the moral quality of life communicated by the schools. It is not accidental that the chief humanists of the 12th century, or of the 14th century to the 16th centuries, that many humanists of the 17th century, and that the "Matthew Arnolds" of the 19th century, were preoccupied with school reform. If we want to recover their kind of humanism (indeed if we are to provide for the 20th century a decent sort of education), we must, as literary scholars, historians, and students of the humanities, forget the ancient sense of empire as constituting what joins man to man and recover the ancient cosmopolitanism, the sense of relationship between fictions and actions, values and myths, of some of those whom we fancy as our forebears. We can recover the older scholar's sense of the function of the critic and scholar as a having to do with the quality of school life in his own time if we mind our business.

I shall argue in my speech that if we are to recover what of our best we have lost, we will have to reshape graduate education; we will have to reshape our conception of the profession. And we will have to reform the Office of Education also. Despite a decade of curriculum reform, American policy has been a token policy as regards the involvement of the humanistic scholar in the reform of the education of teachers. It has been a semiserious policy at the level where the Office of Education acts, at the level where professional societies shape conceptions of the scholar's role, and at the level where university administrators reward and punish their faculties.

I want to take as an emblem of my argument an experience which I had last week. I want to set my experience beside Mr. Glass's picture of human society as having progressed tremendously since the 1820's. Mr. Glass painted a picture of human civilizations making great technological progress, extending the length and quality of life through improvements in physiology, medicine, biochemistry, communication and the like. (Parenthetically, I would argue with Levi-Strauss that the basic reforms which make civilized life possible are not the reforms which have been accomplished since the 1820's but reforms introduced in the Neolithic Period:

It was in neolithic times that man's mastery of the great arts of civilization -- of pottery, weaving, agriculture and the domestication of animals -- became firmly established. No one today would any longer think of attributing these enormous advances to the fortuitous accumulation of a series of chance discoveries or believe them to have been revealed by the passive perception of certain natural phenomena.

Each of these techniques assumes centuries of active and methodical observation, of bold hypotheses tested by means of endlessly repeated experiments. A biologist remarks on the rapidity with which plants from the New World have been acclimatized in the Philippines and adopted and named by the natives. In many cases they seem even to have rediscovered their medicinal uses, uses identical with those traditional in Mexico. Fox's interpretation is this:

> Plants with bitter leaves or stems are commonly used in the Philippines for stomach disorders. If an introduced plant is found to have this characteristic, it will be quickly utilized. The fact that many Philippine groups, such as the Pinatubo Negritos, constantly experiment with plants hastens the process of the recognition of the potential usefulness, as defined by the culture, of the introduced flora [R. B. Fox, pp. 212-13].

To transform a weed into a cultivated plant, a wild beast into a domestic animal, to produce, in either of these, nutritious or technologically useful properties which were originally completely absent or could only be guessed at; to make stout, water-tight pottery out of clay which is friable and unstable, liable to pulverize or crack -- which, however, is possible only if from a large number of organic and inorganic materials, the one most suitable for refining it is selected, and also the appropriate fuel, the temperature and duration of firing and the effective degree of oxidation -- to work out techniques, often long and complex, which permit cultivation without soil or alternatively without water; to change toxic roots or seeds into foodstuffs or again to use their poison for hunting, war or ritual -- there is no doubt that all these achievements required a genuinely scientific attitude, sustained and watchful interest and a desire for knowledge for its own sake. For only a small proportion of observations and experiments, which must be assumed to have been primarily inspired by a desire for knowledge, could have yielded practical and immediately useful results. There is no need to dwell on the working of bronze and iron and of precious metals or even the simple working of copper ore by hammering which preceded metallurgy by several thousand years, and even at that stage they all demand a very high level of technical proficiency.

Neolithic, or early historical, man was therefore the heir of a long scientific tradition Claude Levi-Strauss, [The Savage Mind, pp. 13-15].

Certainly the properties to which the savage mind has access are not the same as those which have commanded the attention of scientists. The physical world is approached from opposite ends in the two cases: one is supremely concrete, the other supremely abstract; one proceeds from the angle of sensible qualities and the other from that of formal properties. But if, theoretically at least and on condition no abrupt changes in perspective occurred, these two courses might have been destined to meet, this explains that they should have both, independently of each other in time and space, led to two distinct though equally positive sciences: one which flowered in the neolithic period, whose theory of the sensible order provided the basis of the arts of civilization (agriculture, animal husbandry, pottery, weaving, conservation and preparation of food, etc.) and which continues to provide for our basic needs by these means; and the other, which places itself from the start at the level of intelligibility, and of which contemporary science is the fruit.[2])

The technology which Mr. Glass pointed to as having given light and glory to the life of the 19th and 20th centuries, this very technology, is the technology which now threatens the extinction of men by virtue of the contamination of the human environment against which Mr. Glass warns; it is this technology which has also created those enormous dislocations in what we like to call "disadvantaged cultures" or "third world cultures": food problems, population problems, urban problems, problems of anomie, etc.

Let me turn to my experience of last week to set it as an emblem beside Mr. Glass's. I went to the Pine Ridge reservation because the practicum schools where we work in Lincoln, Nebraska, deal with American Indian peoples, people who are dislocated, who have a sense of anomie. Many of them are alcoholics. They retain some connections with their traditional culture; many are members of the peyote cult. Some of them are Omaha Indians, some are Sioux. Since their connections with the Macy Omaha reservation and the Oglala Pine Ridge reservation remain, I thought it would be useful for me to visit the Pine Ridge. Moreover, I thought it would be useful for me to try to see what education was like at Pine Ridge since I had read a very brilliant book by an anthropologist named Murray Wax entitled Formal Education in an American Indian Community. This is a work which the Office of Education, Bureau of Research, funded about 1962 and which described a savagely insensitive educational picture.[3]

I don't know how many of you have visited the Pine Ridge. The Pine Ridge reservation covers about a county in South Dakota. There thousands of Indians rot, with no expectations, no jobs, and no hope of jobs. The land is sparse and treeless, the temperature was over a hundred when we were there. The citizens of that reservation and other Siouxan groups were promised all the land from the Platte north and from the middle of Nebraska to Oregon and Washington in 1868; in 1871 the Gold Rush to the Black Hills took place and that promise was destroyed. Mr. Glass pointed out that in the 1820's the life expectancy was about 30 years for citizens of the Western world. At the Pine Ridge, the present life expectancy is variously estimated at 33-38 years. Starvation still exists there.[4] There is no water in most of the shacks on the country side, and the children come to school in the fall with scabs because they have not been able to take baths. The jobs which exist are jobs with the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) which keep people silent and invisible. The hope of the people who live on this reservation is the hope which they can keep alive through education. Sixty-six percent of the children drop out of school. Between 1 and 2% of the Oglala Sioux Indians go to college; of those, most drop out because of their experience with institutional racism in higher education. If education fails in the Pine Ridge, everything goes; for education is the central resource which the people have. It is, in fact, primarily because higher education has failed the citizens of the Pine Ridge that they rot; it has failed them in very obvious ways. The ways, I think, are representative of the ways in which higher education has failed people in the black ghetto, people in Appalachia, Spanish-American people, migrant people in the Southwest, and poor people in the white ghettos of our large cities.

First of all, the teachers who teach at Pine Ridge do not speak the language of the people; they do not speak the dialect. The Pine Ridge Indians speak a dialect of English which is not what you would call standard middle-class English; the teachers do not speak that dialect. Lakota is spoken by 60-75% of the kids, and there are no Lakota-speaking teachers on the Pine Ridge. There are a few Lakota-speaking aides now. The teachers, as Murray Wax pointed out 10 years ago, do not live in the communities where the parents live. They do not participate in the community's activities. They live in separate enclaves and regard the American Indian peoples with something like condescension.[5]

This was not the case in the 1930's. Then the teachers taught in one-room rural school houses and were necessarily thrown back for entertainment, for cultural activities, etc., on the games and communal activities which were provided in the rural Indian communities. I had two sessions with educators at the Pine Ridge. One was a Jesuit priest; I found him an admirable man. He began by saying why education has failed at the Pine Ridge and at the Holy Rosary Mission -- why Catholic education had failed there. He said that Catholic education had failed because "we had forgotten the lessons which Catholic educators, Jesuit educators had learned in the 17th century in China: lessons having to do with the necessity for syncretism in religion; the necessity for bilingual and bicultural education; the necessity for a sympathetic attitude toward alien cultures." Those Jesuits to whom he was looking, those Jesuit educators who went to China and created a bilingual-bicultural education in China, were educators trained in the best traditions of the 15th and 16th centuries; they were trained in the attitudes of a Petrarch, a Boccaccio in notions akin to those of the Florentine Platonic academy.

The priest with whom we talked had some complaints. He had some complaints against higher education, and some complaints against the government. One of these was that there were virtually no books written in Lakota (a few were written in the 30's and before). Indeed, there is no dictionary of the language. Extant lexicons are out of date. A linguist has gone to the Pine Ridge to create a lexicon of the Lakota language, apparently quite a good linguist. He can't find a publisher because of a lack of interest. And, therefore, for the want of a decent lexicon and full linguistic work, very few reading books have been created in the Lakota language. The priest also had some complaints about research. He did find one piece of research useful in his schools, a piece of research done by a psychologist named Father John Bryde, called Acculturational Psychology, a course which is taught to children in the ninth grade. The course was developed by a research man who lived with the Oglala Sioux for some time -- many years as I understand. He spoke Lakota well and participated in the rituals, ceremonies, tale-tellings, and hand games of the group. His course was, as I understand, not originally created out of research which was funded by the BIA; it was not funded by the Office of Education. Eventually after the course had been taught for some years in the Catholic schools of the Pine Ridge reservation, it was bought by the BIA and is now used in the BIA Pine Ridge schools.

It is interesting to look at the first section of the book, Acculturational Psychology; the book describes what are the values of the Oglala Sioux. It describes for the Oglala Sioux youngsters what are the values of the Oglala Sioux culture as opposed to those of the white man's civilization. It tells the child what values he must suppress in order to meet white man's civilization on its own terms: "The first value which you must suppress is that of generosity. This is the impulse to give away everything which you have. The second value which you must suppress is the value of concern for the common profit, concern for the profit of the group as more significant than the profit of the individual. The third value which you must suppress is an emphasis upon individual risk-taking, individual bravery."

One could go through a repertoire of other values which must be suppressed or replaced if one were to function in the white man's culture, if the child is to make it at the game of acculturation.

Our second session at the Pine Ridge was at the BIA school at Pine Ridge. I met with some BIA teachers who were very helpful people and with three of the elders of the tribal council. One was named Amos Bad-Heart Bull. His uncle, also named Amos Bad-Heart Bull, was the historian (the Livy) of the Oglala Sioux's culture. He made a magnificent account of the last 100 years of Oglala Sioux civilization and his pictures of those years are probably the best pictures of the culture and history of the plains people.[6] Mr. Bad-Heart Bull is a full-blood and a conservative. There were two other men there -- one, Mr. One-Feather, a kind of middle-of-the-roader, as I gathered; and one person whom I shall call Mr. Moreau who described himself as a "militant Indian."

I asked these men about the Accultural Psychology course. "Mr. Moreau" said he liked the course. He said he thought the only thing wrong with the course was that it wasn't sufficiently "efficient." It taught children to live in two worlds when it was really impossible for men to live in two worlds; he regarded the myth that they could live in two worlds as a capricious myth. "Mr. Moreau" seemed to say that the notion that you can practice Indian values when you are with Indian people and white man's values when you are with white people is simply naive: "What we must do to our children is to teach them to enter the white man's rat race and to play to the hilt." What he was asking for, essentially in the name of self-determination, was the destruction of his own culture and its tradition; and he was asking that education do the destroying.

The second man was named Mr. One-Feather. He said very mildly, "When I graduated from school, I had to learn the lessons that I needed to know in order to be a member of white man's civlization; the school games did not teach me the white man's game which is essentially the game of manipulation." He said he didn't know whether he wanted to learn it or to what degree he wanted to learn it. He at least wanted to learn how the game was played and to be able to detect it when it was being played by white people. He also suggested that new Indian institutions ought to be created and that these institutions ought not to "eliminate", as it were, traditional Indian cultural values; they ought to be essentially syncretic institutions. Then he began to talk about the extent to which Indian institutions, as presently constituted, are projections into the reservation of extra-reservation power structures.

The third man, Mr. Bad-Heart Bull, was a very heavy man; he was a man who had made it. He had gone on to graduate work.

He began by speaking of 10,000 years of Indian history, of the stories of his culture, and then he began to talk of the Acculturational Psychology book. And he said, "Well really the book makes no sense because what it talks about are values as separated from our religion. No one can understand the Oglala Sioux values apart from the religious systems and the religious rituals which give them force. When you speak of generosity, you must speak of the sun dance and you must speak of the extent to which, when we tore our own flesh, we indicated that we were willing to be generous to God and be generous to our fellow-man." To enforce the virtue of generosity as apart from those rituals, as apart from the cognitive schemata embodied in those rituals, would be to speak nonsense.[7]

This is a culture which is labelled conventionally in educational text books as a "deprived culture." It is a culture which is rapidly vanishing because there is no language training being given in Lakota Sioux by the schools. The myths of the Lakota Sioux are not part of the school curricula whereas the Greco-Roman sometimes are. The schools have not developed into syncretic institutions, and there has been very little surrender of power over the schools to the Indian parents.

What we are seeing at the Pine Ridge is the destruction of a culture by an educational system: we are seeing the destruction of a culture by the kind of technological savagery which will not permit the existence of alternative belief systems or even of alternative scientific systems. (And by the way, one ought not to postulate that pretechnological cultures do not have scientific systems. I think one of the great virtues of recent anthropological research, particularly Levi-Strauss's research, has been to show us the extent to which such cultures did and do have their own scientific logics.) Our "progress" provides for the replacement of an older technological system by a new one; in the process we watch -- as from the hills above Sodom -- the destruction of one culture and its values. We watch, somewhat idly, the destruction of a thing from which we might learn and which might be exceedingly valuable to us in another time. Plains Indian civilization lived for very many thousands of years without endangering itself with respect to the pollution of the environment; that civilization experienced very little in the way of mental depression or mental breakdowns until it encountered the white settler's way of life in its nineteenth century form. And that civilization fulfilled the conditions of a healthy culture as described by J. F. Scott and R. L. Lynton in The Community Factor in Modern Technology. According to this study changes are slow in such "healthy" cultures, important groups small, and no one stands alone in them. In a society in which change is rapid and in which important groups are large, where everyone stands alone and where many men go mad, we may stand to profit from looking at other sorts of life and at what they have to say.[8]

The research man has taken to himself a curious role at the Pine Ridge. If higher education has failed in the education of teachers for the Pine Ridge, if we have failed to produce teachers who can speak the Lakota language; if we have failed to produce teachers who understand the Oglala Sioux myths; if we have failed to produce teachers who understand history from the perspective of "other" people; if we have failed utterly to produce teachers who have any sense of what humanism might constitute or what cosmopolitanism might be, even so perhaps the researchers among us have done some good by providing the knowledge to do better things and seeing to it that action programs based upon this knowledge are carried out. Ten years ago Murray Wax turned out his magnificent study. So far as I could see no one on the reservation had read it or heard of it; certainly the book had nothing to do with school policy as presently conducted there. I was told that there are 20 research studies being conducted by higher education on the Pine Ridge reservation, none of them related to action programs, none of them seriously related to doing a job. Recently, a group of Augustana College youngsters from Sioux Falls, South Dakota, came to one of the villages on the reservation to help with tutoring in a summer program and were nearly driven from the town because of the thought that they were "another group of researchers" come to "help" the Oglala Sioux solve their problems by studying them.

I describe the Pine Ridge situation because I think it represents a caricature of what higher education has done -- the failure in modern education of the kind of humanism represented by Boccaccio, Petrarch, Lorenzo de Medici and the Jesuit Chinese missionaries. It is very easy to see the Oglala Sioux situation as corollary to the history of the rise of empire: the white man's military expansion, conquest, spread of technology, education, scientific betterment, and all those things which do good for people and destroy their cultural economy. It is also very easy to see the Oglala Sioux as a perverse people; they will not give up; they have not given up. They will not give up to empire; they will not give up to the new technology; and they will not give up to the new sort of education.

Technology, the educational system, particularly those systems which have been devised by behavioral psychologists who are not particularly sensitive to differences in cultural style -- these things constitute a new imperialism in our culture; we are utterly without flexibility and without imagination in the application of our systems. What we are finding is that black men, brown men, Mennonites, Doukhobors, Bohemians, Appalachian poor whites -- all are rebelling against the melting pot concept and against the impeccable systems which we create to make them melt. The central problem of education is not the problem of how we can create better systems which will manipulate people into postures where they will concede to our systems. The central problem is to understand the accent of their cultures and to get to their cultures such educational expertise as will permit them a degree of self-realization.

Our American empire -- perhaps partly because it has grown by importing peoples and exporting technology (instead of growing only by conquering peoples to do work) -- has asked people to give up their history and their culture in a way which is unique and complete. I want to turn to one of the poets of Empire who was also one of the favorite poets of the Medieval and Renaissance humanists, Virgil, as a kind of model of what traditional humanism was: its limitations and its virtues. To turn to Virgil may be appropriate in the context of my talk about the Pine Ridge since Willa Cather and a number of other Midwestern writers talk about the coming of white man to the plains, as analogous to Aeneas' journey to Rome (they also talk about Israel's journey to Canaan). The leaving behind of that burning Trojan civilization and the coming to the plains of Latium is like leaving behind the burning European civilization and coming to the plains of the Midwest. It is easy to see the natives of Latium, the Etruscans, and so forth as a parallel to the native American Indians. It is important to remember that the Aeneas who came to the plains of Latium carried with him the household gods of Troy but that he also paid respect to the gods of Latium. His visit to the sow, his marriage to Lavinia, and so forth are indications of the deference which he pays to the traditional Italic civilizations of the land in which he founds his empire. World empires that have been built up in the past have generally been a confusion of a cosmopolitan system and local cultures. The empire of the Romans was essentially an imposition of Roman law upon native cultural traditions. Such a fusion has been recognized by most major world empires which have emerged since. We, perhaps alone, stand ready to erase the Gods of Latium and to kill Lavinia rather than to marry her.

Earlier I spoke of two old "secular" conceptions of the sources of human brotherhood. One says that human brotherhood is rooted in the force of arms: it is a vision of a monarchy which can extend throughout the world and of which all men will be citizens, pacified by brute force -- a vision which Anchises displays to Aeneas during his descent into the lower world. The other vision is a vision of a human brotherhood won by pity, piety, respect for the gods of other people, and a capacity to imagine one's way into other people's belief systems. This is precisely what Aeneas does throughout his journey.

It would be dishonest to assert that the old humanists were not deeply concerned with the imperial design. They were.[9] They looked to Virgil as a magician, teacher, and prophet, but also more specifically, as the prophet of world empire -- the announcer of that empire which began with Augustus and could be restored by a Henry VII or a Charles V -- or even as the prophet of that heavenly empire in which all men are brothers and of which Christ is King. They looked to a universal imperium based on the force of arms, eagles, and triumphs: the forcing of the cultural mold insofar as the international aspects of culture are concerned. In the medieval and Renaissance Holy Roman Empire, in 17th and 18th century France, in the England of the 18th and 19th centuries, and finally in the America of the 19th century, the primary style of academic culture has been a style derived from later imperial culture. We were taught our grammar and our sense of dramatic form by Donatus; we were taught our rhetoric by Cicero; we were taught our logic by the Latin rhetoricians and Aristotle. The education which we received -- education in the liberal arts, in the rhetorical arts, and in the arts of slaying people -- was an education based on Roman formulations.[10] The Roman legal formulation determined many of our conceptions of civility -- even in England and America where common law had force. The oratorical education which we received was an oratorical education designed to make civil servants the rulers of men, to consolidate masses of people, and to make it possible for the civil servant to rule an empire. That academic Rome, and the imaginary empire of which it was a part, began to recede from men's vision in the 17th and 18th centuries, partly with the decline of the use of the Latin language as a spoken tongue. The religious idea of empire did not entirely go to pieces; at times during the 18th and 19th centuries there were a great many people talking about a providential empire or a republic guided by providence in its armed movement; in fact, one still hears Mr. Nixon talking about a pax Americana. The notion of a mankind united by the force of arms and by rhetorical and legal styles which can consolidate what the force of arms has conquered, this notion we have finally lost, probably for the good of us all. The notion of the creation of a sense of a common humanity based in a common imperium is no longer educationally meaningful.

The other humanistic stream does have some meaning to us. The humanist who contributes to this stream is the man who understands man's common humanity by virtue of understanding man's unique cultural diversity. The humanist understands man's common humanity by understanding regional custom and beliefs. He is the man who can look across boundaries. The stories which men tell and the actions which they perform are very closely related to one another. The myths which they tell one another, and the institutions which they create, the ways in which they learn, the mythoi of the culture, and the culture itself are all of a piece. Perhaps one great contribution of Levi-Strauss is to restore this sense of the function of literature and the function of fiction. If I may appropriate one of Kenneth Boulding's assumptions, "learning (perception) is essentially a modification of our image of the world, and action is essentially embodied in it." Unless our schools learn to take seriously how man imagines the world, they will never take seriously how they can teach men to re-imagine the world.

As I have asserted, the great humanist tradition of school reform began with John Salisbury in the 12th century and the Metalogicon; it continued with Boccaccio and Petrarch in Italy and Chancellor Gerson in France; it continued in the 16th century with the reformers of the Florentine Platonic academy and the reformers of the 16th century academies in France. It reached one sort of apogee in the 17th century, "Battle of the Books," epitomized by the fight between Bentley and Swift. Swift in his Fable of the Bee had represented the variety of cultures and of wisdoms under the metaphor of flowers, and had spoken of those two things which the humanist could gather from the flowers of other times, sweetness and light. It is not accidental that when the last representative of the humanist tradition in our culture, Matthew Arnold, tried to describe the functions of literature and the functions of a literary education he chose as the title of his essay Swift's phrase, Sweetness and Light.

The effort to reach toward cosmopolitanism and toward reform of the schools, in the interest of a thoroughly cosmopolitan and civil vision, fell. It fell before the Bentleys of the 17th century who inaugurated the era of scientific study of literary classics. It fell before the Grimms of the 19th and early 20th centuries and particularly before those who appropriated the work of the Grimms in order to develop national myths: the myths of Germany celebrated in Wagner and recelebrated in debased form by Hitler's legions. In imitation of the Germans, literary critics all over America have been looking for the "American myth," "the great American novel" -- as if there were one America and one American dream. The humanism of an Arnold fell before the philologists who were sterile pedants and the new critics who insisted that art cannot speak to the way in which men live. And finally, this vision faded with the development in America of great universities modelled along the German model in which humanistic scholars endeavored to do research along German scientific lines and concerned themselves very little with conditions around them.

Now the primary function of graduate literary departments is to "turn out" Ph. D's, who "turn out" Ph. D's who will in turn "turn out" more Ph. D's who will teach freshman and sophomore courses which do nothing for compositional ability or love of literature and advanced literary courses to professional "students of literature" who will have very little effect upon the quality of the imaginative life of others and who will probably themselves very quickly stop reading what they do not teach. Look at the number of literary courses which there are in this country and then look at the way Americans read, what they look at on television, what their taste is, and more important what their cosmopolitanism is: what their sense of civility, their capacity to imagine their way from culture to culture is; to look so is to develop for oneself a very severe indictment of American graduate education.

The essential humanistic job, I think, is to be a critic. Not only of the literary works, but of the way in which life is imagined in a literary work. It is to be a critic of the ways in which all of us imagine life. We ought to be concerned with the folk imagination. We ought also to be concerned with the imagination of man expressed in the schools as institutions. Is the imagination of man expressed in the schools a narrow mechanistic, behavioristic, imagination, or is it of another sort? Is the imagination of the sort which could conceivably be said to partake of the spirit of Boccaccio or Petrarch? We ought to be concerned with the imagination of man expressed by our novelists and poets. We ought also to be concerned to understand the imagination of man as expressed by older cultures such as that of Pine Ridge and by prophets who appear in modern outsider's cultures, the Cleaver's and the Malcolm X's.

Our essential function is to teach. And it is to teach not only how a work is put together, but how a work means for the way in which man lives. If we are to teach as graduate scholars, I would not advocate that all of us go into elementary and secondary schools (it would not hurt a great many of us to go there), but it is terribly significant that we be involved in curricular construction. That would require that we be in the schools. That might require that we be involved in the kinds of projects that Bentley Glass and Kenneth Boulding described. It might require that we begin to review the quality of textbooks being offered in America's public schools and that we begin to review the way in which schools operate. We might, for instance, look at the context to which a humane literary imagination is expressed in such schools as those presently conducted at the Pine Ridge. It is important that we begin to teach the other American stories and how they mean; it is equally important that we begin to teach something about the valuation of humanity that appears in those stories.

I am distressed by what I see in the schools where I work. The fictions which many kids recount to me are predominantly fictions in which the primary capacity of man is the capacity to inflict pain upon other men superior to that which they can "reinflict." Brian Sutton-Smith has spoken of three kinds of ways in which games work: strategic games which involve man's logical powers; physical force games which involve the imposition of physical force on another person; and chance games which involve the assumptions of a providence.[11] One can apply the same schemata to the stories kids tell. The vision of man which is expressed in the stories which the children I encounter tell is not often a vision of man as guided by providential destiny, not Virgil's vision; it is not a vision of man as capable of reason, of using a range of logical strategies to win through the exercising of logical strategy. It is all too often a vision of man primarily as capable of hurting other men and of winning through the application of physical force. If you doubt my observations of children's fictions, I would suggest that you read the reports of Urie Bronfrenbrenner concerning young people's actions.

But my counsels are not entirely counsels of despair with respect to the reform of graduate education. I have some suggestions. First of all, it seems to me that one of the reasons why we have so few people, good people, from the disciplines working in the schools is that we have asked so few to work in the schools. I have over a dozen people either working on Ph. D. 's under me presently or recently finished with them. They are working on such topics as "The Faerie Queene as Herculiad." Their topics have no obvious connection with the state of the schools. I have had some of them work beside me in a few of the projects I've been working on. Almost without exception these people have said, "If you could give me a job where I could serve in the schools, where I can have some meaningful task like the kind of tasks that you have, find it for me. I'll take a cut in salary, a sizeable cut, in order to have such a job." Very, very few of them have been asked, have been invited by the academic departments to take such jobs or used seriously in a role with schools when they assumed their jobs. In the next five years, the kids of the New Left who will be coming into our graduate departments will be looking for jobs congenial to their political commitments. Their sense of the present meaninglessness of the academic profession is closely related to the decline of what I call "the humanistic enterprise." I think we ought to undertake some kind of national campaign particularly to recruit kids of the New Left into the schools: we ought to put the monkey on their backs to do with and for the poor, the black, the Pine Ridge people.

Secondly, it seems to me that we must develop a much wider sense of what constitutes legitimate literary study. We ought to develop a sense that looking at folk myths, at their relationship to perception and action is exceedingly important, that it is proper in an English department or a literature department.

Thirdly, I think we ought to pay some attention to the ways in which children imagine the world and the stories which they read and the stories which we can offer to them. One of the children I worked with in a school, saw himself primarily as a dehumanized monster. He used to walk around as a kind of Frankenstein. It was not hard to see why he did this. He came from a very oppressed home. The home itself was a sort of gothic home; the shades were pulled; the mother retreated when one came to visit. Characteristically, the gothic monster is the creation of an antihuman, emotionally castrated, intellectual;[12] the fact that this child imagined himself as a type of Frankenstein monster says something of the school of which he is a part as well as of the home from which he came. We should ask our graduate students to pay some attention to the process of education, to the relationship between the ways in which children imagine the world and the ways in which adults imagine the world, the relationship between the ways in which the books which children read mean and the ways in which the books which adults read mean. To extend this argument, it seems to me that, with reforms in graduate education, must come some seriousness about the schools as agents of civility, agents of the development of the sense of justice, competence, and cosmopolitan humanity.

We are not all that serious now. We recruit, for our teaching profession generally, people from slightly below the middle of the average of the high school class. We tend to recruit the noncommitted, those who (according to NEA statistics) do not join civil rights organizations and are not committed to the forwarding of the civil rights movement. We train over 50% of these teachers at AAUP D, E, and F institutions. We send the most provincial, the least experienced, the least cosmopolitan of these teachers to outsider's cultures where most cosmopolitanism is demanded. We spend $1,500 to $2,000 each year on the education of teachers and $5,000 to $8,000 on the education of doctors. We have put no muscle in our programs for the reform of teacher education comparable to that which is in the "NSF Science Development Grants" which do permanently change the shape of an institution (summer institutes don't). We have displayed very little seriousness in higher education with respect to the reforms which we have proposed for elementary education. Certainly in English this is the case; Andre Paquette said that nothing had happened to foreign language education as a consequence of the curriculum reform movement and the institutes. He said that there had been a 1% change in foreign language education. The reforms of secondary and elementary education in the areas of linguistics, rhetoric, and literary teaching (which have been insisted upon by scholars in higher education as necessary to the schools if they are to do their job) have in turn been reflected in about 10% to 15% of the courses taught by college English departments. We have also insisted upon, or tolerated, intolerant national norms. Look at the tests of language competence and verbal ability put out, say, by Educational Testing Service (ETS) and supposedly reflecting what higher education is demanding; look at them from the perspective of a descriptive linguist and you will discover the extent to which what we are demanding is not competence, but conformity to a cultural style. Our very tests suggest the lack of humanism and a lack of cosmopolitanism which is ours. The long shadows of Latin imperial culture still hang over the park where ETS does its thing.

If we are to do a serious job, I think finally we must recruit, for the job of reforming the schools, good people in higher education and many of them. This has not happened in English. The Wally Douglas's, the Paul Olson's, the Jim Miller's, and a few other people have been the "house niggers" for the humanities professors; the social scientists have found a few of their own. As one social scientist put it to me, "We might be able to find a few people who might interest themselves in something unusual." In psychology the people who have been concerned with reforming the schools have been the very best psychologists around: the Joe McVicker Hunts, the Skinners, the Flavells, the Bruners, the Sutton-Smiths, and so forth. To a degree the scientists have been successful in a similar way (although not in actually bringing people into an intimate relationship with the schools) in getting a large group of the best scientists to work at the reform of the curriculum. This has not happened in English; it has not happened in those humanistic studies where the need for change is greatest. We must have the best professors that higher education has to offer and many of them. If we are really serious, we must recruit our teachers from the upper 50% of our undergraduate classes. We must train them at our best institutions, at the Harvards, at the best land grant colleges, and so forth. We must send the best experienced, the brightest, the most flexible students, the most cosmopolitan students, to outsider's cultural groups. We ought to develop very quickly a program to up the investment in the education of teachers, simply as a matter of fiscal management, so that we spend between \$3,000 to \$4,000 per year on the preparation of each teacher rather than \$1,500 to \$2,000. I susp[illegible]hat if you put that kind of money into the job, things would cha[illegible]quite quickly. We need to change the concept of vocation in the academic departments, particularly the departments in the humanities. We need, finally, to cultivate a humanism which will not allow for the savagery of Pine Ridge. And that I think is not so much a matter of money or a matter of policy; it is a matter of conviction, it is a matter of the development of genuine understanding, the development of a capacity to cherish alternative visions and the myths of other cultures. It is a development which requires the creation of a new capacity to perceive what constitutes the human identity -- a concept more profound than any which could be based on the assumption that man is the kind of creature that can be pushed into recognizing his obligation to other men through a force of arms which will create a Pax Romana or a Pax Americana.[13]

Kenneth Boulding has spoken of the spaceship earth, where all men must discover beneath the pink, brown, black and so forth, beneath the variety of cultures and genetic types which we are, the common biological entity which is mankind; he has spoken of the world of possibility and of the meaningful antagonism which the educational arena affords. Mr. Boulding has expressed these notions more eloquently than I can. Perhaps the new image of man will be an image of man which sees man as having things in common only because all men belong to a common species. Perhaps what we will see as common to men is not that they can be suppressed by the force of arms but that they can express themselves through language; perhaps what we will see as common to men is a capacity to create images in terms of which they can remodel the world. In any case, we shall need a new kind of conception of what constitutes the academic enterprise when it serves both the cultures in which we are rooted and a rootless technological culture if we are to have a world where organized violence capable of world-wide effects is only used at the behest of a global community which participates in decisions as to its use.[14]

Sometimes it is very difficult to tell the humanists from the non-humanists. I have three incidents. One of these involved a discussion which I had some weeks ago, with one of the most powerful men in American higher education. I said, "I think that what higher education has not understood is that black culture in this country does constitute to a degree an adversary culture. Black culture has been an invisible culture; there are things from the Caribbean and African culture -- learning styles, games, and so forth -- which black people in this country still have and which they suppress in the presence of white people." My adversary answered without hesitation: "Black culture was never an adversary culture; I played with black children all the time when I was a little boy in the South." Then he cited the Jenson study to me. The second humanist to which I should like to refer is one of the most powerful men in the humanities professional associations. I wrote to him not too long ago asking him for reforms along the lines of those requested in his speech, and he wrote back to me saying, "Don't ask me to lead a parade. Power is where money is. We asked the Office of Education for money for the disadvantaged and none came. Don't ask me to lead a parade." The third statement by a black ghetto kid who is trying to develop some educational reforms in the Woodlawn area in Chicago in part by using the Blackstone Rangers to get the kids interested in schools and in part by using illiterate mothers and aides in the schools to train teachers as to how the children of the black community should be taught; his is a statement made at a recent conference -- "You took lots of things from us in the 'educational' process that we are trying to get back. The Navajos still have their culture and their language. We don't have ours. We are trying to get it back through the black Afro-American history. People say, 'Well, you shouldn't be involved in that kind of thing, that wastes time, why don't you learn about American democracy?' We've learned about that; we've lived it."[15]

References

[1] The researches of Paré, Tremblay and Brunet on the schools of the twelfth century are helpful; cf. John of Salisbury's Metalogicon and Hugh of St. Victor's Didascalion. For Boccaccio and Petrarch, see Osgood's translation of Boccaccio on Poetry. Cf. DeNohlac's researches on Petrarch, and Marinelli's recent work; for Florence, see Chastel's Florentine Humanism in the Time of Lorenzo de Medici, for France, Frances Yates, The French Academies in the 16th Century. The "Battle of the Books" has been treated by Marjorie Nicholson and R. F. Jones and Arnold has been treated by Lionel Trilling and by G. Summerfield in his recent edition of Arnold's school reports (Cambridge).

[2] Claude Levi-Strauss's, The Savage Mind (Chicago, 1967), p. 269; assists one in understanding the relationship between cognitive schemata, myths, and the life of a culture in a way which is basic to my argument.

[3] Murray Wax, Formal Education in an American Indian Community, Social Problems (Spring, 1964).

[4] Estimated at 33 years by Father Labaty; at 38, by the publication Red Cloud Country. Starvation at Pine Ridge was recently looked into by Dr. Donald Gotch who looked into starvation in North Carolina.

[5] Murray Wax, passim; also our interviews.

[6] Amos Bad-Heart Bull, A Pictographic History of the Oglala Sioux (University of Nebraska Press, 1968).

[7] For the sun dances, see also Hartley Burr Alexander, The World's Rim.

[8] In addition to J. F. Scott and R. L. Lynton, The Community Factor in Modern Technology (UNESCO, 1952) p. 15, see also Jan Van den Berg, The Changing Nature of Man, particularly the sections on "sociosis."

[9] For this theme, see Passavant d'Entreve, Dante As A Political Thinker; Hans Baron, Italian Civic Humanism; Aldo Bernardo, Petrarch's Africa; Chastel, cited supra; Yates, supra; Kantorowicz, The King's Two Bodies.

[10] Roman education and western education; see Marrou, St. Augustine and the End of Ancient Culture; Aries, Centuries of Childhood; Kantorowicz, supra.

[11] Brian Sutton-Smith and J. M. Roberts, "Child Training and Game Involvement" Ethnology (1962), 166-185; cf. Sutton-Smith's other publications). See my essay, "The Imagination of Violence and Love in Children's Fantasies," publication of Nebraska State Department of Education.

[12] Cf. William Fitch Axton's introduction to his edition of Melmoth: The Wanderer for useful remarks on the meaning of the Gothic.

[13] Paul A. Olson, "The Preparation of Teachers: An Evaluation of The State of Teacher Preparation Programs," The Education Professions: 1968 (Washington, 1969), pp. 32-46.

[14] Kenneth Boulding in The Alternative of Radicalism, Tri-University Project report, available Tri-U Project, Lincoln, Nebraska.

[15] The quote is from Anthony Gibbs in A Pride of Lions, Tri-U Project report, Lincoln, Nebraska.

THE TRIBES OF YESTERYEAR

Donald N. Bigelow

Director, Division of College Programs
Bureau of Educational Personnel Development
United States Office of Education

Presented at the
Grove Park Institute of the Consortium of Professional Associations
for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs
Asheville, North Carolina
June 10-15, 1969

THE TRIBES OF YESTERYEAR

For more reasons than coincidence can provide, I fear, in the past year I have often found myself speaking before, during, or after, Paul Olson. Someone once said that it was like a performance of the James brothers and, until recently, I was pleased to wonder whether I was Henry or William -- only to be reminded that people were more likely thinking of an earlier set of James brothers.

Like Paul Olson, who has just recounted his experience on a reservation, I, too, have been out in the academic forest looking for the trees. (Or is it that log that Mark Hopkins felled?) In any case, were I to tell you about my last trip to a reservation, a place in Princeton, I could -- at considerable length -- draw from that trip a message, a message much less well-delivered than Paul's, but otherwise not so very different. At least, let me indicate, as my contribution to this enterprise in North Carolina, that the message I continually hear is: "When are we going to begin to talk about the academic world -- its schools, its colleges, and its universities -- *the way it really is*, instead of continuing to speak about academia while wearing our nineteenth-century rose-colored glasses? When will the truth be spoken? How much longer do we have to wait before we can even begin to assess ourselves honestly, before we begin to see the world in which we live so much to our own advantange also to the advantage of our students?"

My recent trip to the wilds of New Jersey, like so many other trips I make, was only another attempt to try to understand the reason for my failure to communicate when I am outside Washington -- and to learn what this means. For when I am in Washington I seem to have a clear vision as to what is happening in the country. But when I get outside the Office of Education, anywhere, I have learned that I am almost totally unable to say what I think *and* be understood -- much less accepted. I had begun to worry about the simple art of speaking, something that had never caused me much concern in the past! For I had long given up the notion that my failure to communicate was because anybody out there feared me as a civil servant, or was worried about "federal control" since, as history has shown time and time again, colleges and universities seem bound and determined to go their own way until, as Adlai Stevenson once said at a crucial moment in history, "hell freezes over."

Generally, on campus after campus, I learn that if and when the university is ready to do this or that, they'll let Washington know.

While I accept the fact that this is traditional, that it's in the right spirit, and that it is, perhaps, the only noble stand to take, still, I do wonder if our leadership is to be as individualized as that (when all about us questions are being asked and queries made about the role and reason of the university in terms of tomorrow's needs), who is going to take the lead in helping them, and the country, to agree on some common needs for survival, so that we may reasonably expect the university to continue to be central to the survival of civilization.

In the name of scholarship and in search of research, the university has largely abrogated its responsibility to provide even its own undergraduates with an education that will begin to prepare them or their children for life in the next century. Worse, the university has failed even more miserably to prepare today's teachers, their own included, so that they might be able to explain the past in terms of the present either for students in the great ghettos or for those on the great campuses.

It would seem to me that you and I, and our colleagues, live like the Indians of the nineteenth century, which we so favor. We are nothing more or less than a bunch of tribes wandering about the land leaving our wives behind us. Members of this tribe and that tribe occasionally surface at a national meeting sponsored by the MLA, the AHA, the AAAS, or, at one like the present occassion, and, after the ceremonies are done and over, return to our other tribal affiliations on campus.

The major problem I have in communication is a result of the fact that, after I came to the Office of Education, I became detribalized. Raised as a historian, with due respect for Carlton J. H. Hayes, I learned some of the differences that existed among tribes simply by living south of 120th Street. With no reluctance I also entered into that state of grace which permitted me to consort with the other, greater members of my own tribe, and I can announce that among my friends and former colleagues are some of those who are today's leaders in the field of history. I am proud of them; they are proud of themselves. This is the way of life in a tribe, to accept the role you play without reservation. My problem in communication is that, although I have left the tribe, I still belong to it, but also, at the same time, I have become detribalized. (In short: I don't belong to any particular tribe any more.) In getting to that new (dare I say higher) state, I've been called a deserter, even an "educationist," but, as they say, that's life, too! Still it doesn't make the art of communication any easier. That is why I came to North Carolina. I had hoped to be able to remind this particular representation of those vagrant tribal groups known as the disciplines, of one of the problems of some of us who travel about -- and not all of us are based in Washington.

I'd like to speak of what I think the tribal problem is. Inevitably, it relates to the term "disciplines." While I could argue that there is no such thing as a discipline, by definition, except possibly one or two of the sciences, I won't pursue that since it's an irrelevancy, if not pure blasphemy. There are, as we all know, a lot of disciplines, and they are in the saddle. Though I may find it hard to define a discipline that calls itself English, I am still as willing to accept it, as I am to accept history, geography, and all the others.

In the four years since Berkeley, if the students had really known what they were doing, they would have attacked you, as representatives of the disciplines -- these particular tribes -- rather than those administrators who so often fell all too easily. The students' target should be the faculties of the colleges and universities who have been castrated by the tribalization process during which history, English, and all the rest of the disciplines have lost whatever potency they once had.

As members with tenure, you have privileges to the sanctuary, to which even the administrator is not allowed. While this is an understandable technique to help achieve and guarantee academic freedom, it also makes your position unassailable when you wear your hat as a member of the faculty. But you also wear another hat -- that of your discipline. And if the universities are to change -- as I believe they must for the future of democracy, as well as for their own survival -- and if the administrators can't reach you, as they sometimes try to do, then, perhaps, you should be appealed to directly. Perhaps the way to the power structure is to ask the disciplines to look at themselves through their professional associations, those sacred dragons that guard the high church. Lest you have not yet realized it, that is why we are meeting in North Carolina. We want to ask you, as an automatic representative of a discipline, to look at yourself, but not as a member of a society loosely brought together sometime in the past for reasons which no longer exist, nor as a faculty member, but rather in your role of Man Thinking. It is quite possible that the tranquil hills of North Carolina may be a better place for you to see yourself as Man Thinking than on your own campus, where immediately you must don another hat and assume other duties.

I urge you to use the real power that you have, not the power of the disciplines, but the power each of you has as an individual, as Man Thinking. I am asking you to consider seriously the plight of American education. I am asking you to become detribalized.

The route I propose is the avenue of the professional associations, those organizations to which most of us belong; whose magazines supported by our annual contribution, we receive monthly and discard daily. It is time for us to find out to what we are paying homage and to question the mythology of the disciplines that we appear to have accepted as gospel. While, as professionals, we may find it necessary to continue reading our journals, we must also begin to live as Man Thinking. Somehow, as we continue to pay our dues, these two points of view must be conjoined if ever we are to be sure that our own academic freedom, already secured, is worthwhile. Have we earned the right to use it?

I could, but I won't go into the old business of "publish or perish"; nor will I ask for a moratorium on research until we get American education straightened out, although both are relevant to my theme: the relationship of the liberal arts to teaching.

Since our literature is rich with profound commentaries on the liberal arts, there's little new to say. If I were to raise some questions about just what the liberal arts are, and whether they should continue as they are, I'd do no more than several faculty committees have done as they continue to reshuffle the deck every year on this or on that campus. We don't know what they are doing but we have great hopes for them. (They do have their problems.) Whether or not the liberal arts should be continued in their present condition is something that is in the hands of people like you all over the country. I mention this only because the liberal arts must be considered in examining the relationship of the liberal arts to teaching. Certainly mythology supports the notion that great teaching is done in our liberal arts colleges. Nonsense -- and we all know it. I have been around this country enough to testify personally that any two high school teachers that I come across are better than any 10 college teachers that I see in action as teachers. And I'm being polite, only because so many of you in this audience belong to both camps. Teaching in the liberal arts colleges has decayed beyond mere smell, while we, as geniuses, poets, and authors continue to survive, to our utter satisfaction.

Now, if teaching in the liberal arts college is as poor as I suggest, then we should ask the question why. (Since most people don't agree with my conclusion, of course, it is a question that seldom gets asked -- hence, never answered.) But the answer is so obvious that it is invariably overlooked. No college teacher has ever been prepared to be a teacher in any formal or recognizable manner. That appears to be a well-known fact. We may train men to go to the moon, or to remove your wife's appendix, but damned if we will train the college teacher to be a teacher. (That is partly so because we flatly refuse to think that anyone having anything to do with a college or university should be "trained" in anything. As everybody knows we receive an education and are taught, not trained.)

Hence, the novice in college teaching has to make a choice. He must either accept the fact of his own genius and the notion that teaching is an art which he inherited, or he must try to learn how to teach by mimicking someone else -- the lowest form of apprenticeship. Since most teachers learn by watching other teachers, we can easily see why there are so many poor teachers: there are so many bad models.

From here, we normally would go to the awful word pedagogy and, although I confess that I do not think it is "awful" -- I merely assume you do -- too many problems in communication would arise because of the necessity to introduce another whole set of tribes, those belonging to "education," rather than to the "disciplines." Suffice to say for now that if we have poor teaching in our colleges, if we have failed our undergraduates, we are, for a variety of reasons, failing to teach teachers for our schools. Hence, we are not providing good teaching for the children of America. But since if I were to speak of elementary and secondary education you would tune me out quicker than you would if I were to damn research, I'll stop now and make my tentative conclusion.

Teaching may well be the central theme in American education -- more important even than the latest fad called learning. For teaching refers absolutely to an individual, one whose job it is to help the learner. Poor teachers there are, poor teaching we have, and poor results follow. Clearly, we have yet to learn how to listen to the liberal arts and hear what they have been telling us in terms of our learning about ourselves and how to communicate with others. Equally clearly, we have gone far beyond the liberal arts by confusing them and us with the so-called "disciplines" and by denying the pedagogical subjects which are so naturally a part of it all. Equally clearly, by forming professional organizations, such as are represented here in North Carolina, we have carried the notion of the liberal arts far beyond human reach, far beyond the basic business of teaching. In gaining a profession we have lost the professor. In joining a tribe we have locked in so much of the past that there is little room for the present. Where, oh where, do we go from here? And how do I, as a detribalized civil servant, learn how to communicate with you -- with such a sophisticated group of people representing the lost tribes of yesteryear?

STRUGGLES WITH INCOMPETENCE:

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETY

DISCUSSIONS

> "O Blessed rage for order, Pale Ramon,
> The maker's rage to order words of the sea."
>
> Wallace Stevens

THE DISCUSSION GROUPS

After so much work together -- in session by individual disciplines, and in extemporized inter-disciplinary meetings afterwards -- so many people suddenly packing bags and leaving seems wrong. Like Peyton Place going off the airwaves, with the doctor arrested, indicted, and -- what?

Next installments will ultimately come from these rooms around the Palm Court, or from down below in the Grotto, the Mountaineer, and the Ridge cells, when those who talked there through ten, twelve, fifteen hours, to find where they stand the hard way, by giving ground themselves, go back to their jobs. Wednesday afternoon and Thursday night position parleys often contain statements which sound too different to have come from the same men. "It was Thursday that did it," one says. "Thursday was the swing day."

The intensity cannot be carried in final reports. They are drawn up after battles, and sound too much like communiques, even if they define where the lines are now.

Tape recorders, on the other hand, come straight from the front, with perceptions of the rapporteurs.

THE FINAL REPORT

# of the

ANTHROPOLOGY GROUP:

AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

I ANTHROPOLOGY

American Anthropological Association

Chairman

Conrad Reining

Fred Gearing
Nancie Gonzalez
Edward J. Storey

Recorder

Howard Hitchens. Jr.

ANTHROPOLOGY TALKING:

"All kids learn about cave men."

"What anthropologists do is not what they think. What they do, sometimes, is end up saying, 'Why don't we have a Dutch day and bring all the kids in wearing wooden shoes, waving flags and singing songs?'"

"Power is in Miss Underpaid's hands. We don't even touch her."

"We also may run some considerable risks as we, in fact, try to be a discipline, as these other people are being disciplines."

"Maybe we're the victims of our own insight."

"There's a federation of activities that goes on under the name of anthropology."

"We're too complicated, in one way, and too underdeveloped in another."

"I want some high risk, innovative things taking place."

"You probably haven't had as many disappointed sociologists among the teachers you're working with."

"Our problem is a numbers game. We're working with what we've already done."

"Probably the worst mistake is trying to be too global. Pick a specific problem that looks like it has some mileage in it."

FINAL REPORT OF THE
AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION REPRESENTATIVES:
PROPOSAL FOR A PILOT RESEARCH PROJECT
ANTHROPOLOGY AND EDUCATION

This proposal has been prepared as part of the CONPASS conference held at Grove Park Inn, June 10-15, 1969. It is not to be regarded as a proposal of the American Anthropological Association, but instead it represents the collective opinions and ideas of the undersigned representatives of the AAA.

It has become apparent that there is a need for greater involvement of anthropologists in the education field, and we have devised the following project to demonstrate the past contributions and to develop further the unique potential of anthropology for teacher improvement. We have selected one of the critical problems in teacher behavior -- the teacher's perceptions of decision making within the school context, including both formal and informal aspects of the total situation.

As a demonstration project, we propose to expose systematically a selected group of practising teachers to current anthropological models, especially as they are applied to modern complex societies. This group may be further subdivided in order to test different emphases and techniques of involvement. Furthermore, the format of the program and the exact means by which the training will be transmitted are not here explicitly proposed. (We are, however, aware of the range of possible institutional alternatives, which includes workshops, institutes, in-service training, etc.)

After a period of training, we will compare the attitudinal profile of this group with that of some populations which have not been exposed to see what kinds of differences this training produces. In order to provide a base for this comparison, and running concurrently with the training program, an attitudinal survey will be conducted among representative populations of the teaching profession including intending teachers, practising teachers, and paraprofessionals, all at the elementary level.

We are generally interested in learning to what extent these groups have already internalized anthropological knowledge and concepts. More specifically, we are concerned with the teacher's perceptions of her role relationships as they are structured in the decision-making process.

There are two primary reasons why we, as anthropologists, should be proposing this particular project at this particular time. These are: 1) anthropologists are especially versed in the study of sociocultural systems, and 2) there is evidence of a correlation between an individual's perception of his role and his performance in some settings, e.g., in some industrial situations. A partial assumption underlying our proposal is that there is an intimate relationship between the teacher's perception of the loci of decision making in the structure of the school environment and her ability to function in that context. Aspects of this relationship evince themselves in the teacher's reliance upon support mechanisms, her capacity to innovate, her attitude toward parental control, and her ability to see her own behavior more clearly in the classroom context.

We propose to initiate, at the same time as the above components of this project, a running inventory of anthropological resources, including both literature and personnel. There is no such bank of information presently in existence in spite of an abundance of writings and investigators in the field. It will have an obvious impact on the total project here proposed and will also constitute a significant beginning for an activity of importance to the profession and its alliance with the educational community.

One resource with which we can begin is the list of anthropologists who are presently enrolled in the Council on Anthropology and Education (CAE). At present this list totals 1565 individuals.

OUTLINE OF RESEARCH PLAN

Training Program

Prepare the curriculum
Establish logistics
Select target group
Conduct training
Devise self-evaluation providing of immediate feedback.

Attitudinal Survey

Devise the instrument
Select the population(s)
Conduct the survey
Analyze the results.

Inventory

Transfer present CAE data to EDP format
Collect appropriate bibliographic references
Set up data bank.

Presented by:

David W. Crabb -
Princeton University

Fred Gearing -
Director, Program in Anthropology and Education, AAA

Nancie L. Gonzalez -
University of New Mexico

Conrad Reining -
Secretary, American Anthropological Association

Edward J. Storey -
Southeast Educational Laboratory

Howard Hitchens, Jr. -
Rapporteur

II SCIENCE-MATH

American Association for the Advancement of Science

Chairman

Addison Lee

Kenneth Chapman
Donald Cleland
Philip DiLavore
Edward Kormondy
Arthur Livermore
Byron Yountz

Recorder

J. S. Zangrando

SCIENCE SPEAKING:

"Sort of a MAT type thing?"

"Preparation of 'who' for what? Technicians, teachers, non-science-bound persons?"

"The Chem-study program is now in the public domain."

"Sure is a coincidence. I just finished a questionnaire like that. Of course, I only have thirty-five percent return on it so far."

"Maybe three-four universities that do have the personnel to prepare technology teachers."

"The undergraduate program is designed to prepare graduate students who in turn are expected to complete their Ph. D.'s -- and then feed back into the system. Perpetuating our vocation."

"I wonder if I might attempt a kind of sub-sub-summary here?"

"Many of the curriculum studies started more or less intuitively, more or less in the middle of an academic program."

"Are you seeking a kind of compendium or list, of what now is, or a projection or pattern that might be?"

"We've aired all of our accomplishments and all of our problems."

THE FINAL REPORT

of the

SCIENCE-MATH GROUP:

AAAS SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS

FINAL REPORT OF THE REPRESENTATIVES
OF THE
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE:

In accordance with the charge given to the groups representing specific disciplines, the science and mathematics group reviewed the several curriculum development programs and teacher education programs in these areas. These discussions were followed by identification of problems relating to implementation, discussion of implementation of these programs and the formulation of recommendations. Although these recommendations were formulated in terms of science and mathematics, it is recognized that other disciplines may have problems of similar natures and the group welcomes the opportunity of sharing ideas relating to the improvement of education in its broadest context.

Recommendations

A. That the highest priority be given to the improvement of college teaching by government and foundation support of professional organizations and consortia of universities and colleges to:

1. Develop plans and programs for the preparation of college teachers, soliciting the backing of scholars of highest competence in this development;
2. Develop new and relevant (what to teach in any given situation) college course materials in specific discipline areas as well as interdiscipline areas with the objective of improving college teaching;
3. Develop mechanisms for instruction and participation by pre-service and in-service college teachers in new modes of instruction (i.e., inquiry, skills in questioning, self-paced instructional techniques, testing and evaluation) and in the use of new educational technology (computer assisted instruction, audio tutorial, single concept films, slides for daylight chalkboard use);
4. Develop new programs for the education of two-year college teachers (including in the sciences special attention to those who teach the science and mathematics subjects to prospective technicians);

5. Seek and implement ways of increasing the prestige of quality teaching at the college level;

6. Provide opportunities for college teachers to come into contact with outstanding teachers (awardees of excellence in teaching may offer resources to implement this recommendation);

7. Develop programs of intracollege, and therefore interdiscipline, seminars to focus exclusively on the improvement of college teaching.

B. That high priority continue to be given to programs involving the improvement of science and mathematics teaching at the secondary, elementary and college levels by continued support of professional associations and institutions for:

1. Continuing and improving Summer Institutes, including follow-up programs (see C-2) with increased attention to the college and elementary levels -- a ratio such as 20% college - 50% secondary - 30% elementary is suggested with the elementary institutes designed especially for supervisors, coordinators, and science-mathematics specialists. Particular attention should also be given to coordinators of science and mathematics at the junior high school level;

2. Identifying more clearly than has heretofore been done the objectives of specific institutes and conferences as a basis for adequate evaluation of them;

3. Evaluating existing institutes and conferences both in-service and pre-service with a view to identifying paradigms that could be used in developing new institutes and new programs;

4. Developing specific sample curricular materials specifically for the operation of selected types of institutes at all levels. These materials should provide for the instruction and involvement of participants in new modes of instruction (inquiry, etc.) and use of new educational technology;

5. Developing programs that emphasize specific curriculum materials on the important relationships of science and society;

6. Developing new programs for pre-service teachers including instruction and involvement of students in new modes of instruction and use of new educational technology and in the preparation of new teaching materials;

7. Developing new programs using competent high school students for selected teaching assignments in elementary schools. (Such programs are suggested also for college students, not necessarily pre-service teachers.) Such assignments should be developed as a prestige activity;

8. Developing patterns of integrated or sequenced programs of mathematics/science instruction K-12 (or K-14 or K-16) with a view of eliminating specific course perimeters (i.e., algebra, geometry, etc., in mathematics or biology, chemistry, etc., in science);

9. Developing programs specifically designed for the preparation of junior high school teachers of science and mathematics.

C. That high priority be given by funding agencies to support of:

1. Continuation of existing and reestablishing of Visiting Scientists Programs at the precollege level;

2. Reestablishment of at least minimal support to the area meetings or center meetings such as those so successfully carried out by the PSSC, SMSG and BSCS in the early days of these curriculum studies.

D. That high priority be given to support of professional organizations and other appropriate groups for:

1. Dissemination of plans and patterns of continuing education including not only summer in-service and academic year institutes, cooperative college-school projects, but also science teaching centers, employment in industry, travel, and participation in curricular developments;

2. Development of guidelines for the preparation of elementary and secondary school teachers (and as appropriate, college teachers) that are described in terms of what the teacher should be able to do, that provide for great flexibility recognizing individual differences, and that provide for several routes to certification;

3. Continuing development of new curriculum materials recognizing the increasingly changing state of knowledge in any field and the changing of boundaries among fields.

E. That the Congress and the Government agencies include professional organizations, along with state agencies, school systems, colleges and universities, as acceptable grantees for funds for educational projects.

Presented by:

Kenneth Chapman -
American Chemical Society

Philip DiLavore -
University of Maryland

Clarence Ethel Hardgrove -
Northern Illinois University

Edward Kormondy -
Commission on Undergraduate Education in the Biological Sciences

Addison Lee -
University of Texas

Arthur Livermore -
American Association for the Advancement of Science

John Mayor -
American Association for the Advancement of Science

Byron Youtz -
State University of New York at Old Westbury

Joanna Zangrando -
Rapporteur

III GEOGRAPHY

Association of American Geographers

Chairman

Saul Cohen

Robert Harper
Clyde Kohn
Fred Luckerman
Warren Nystrom
William Pattison
Jewell Phelps
Allen Schmeider

GEOGRAPHERS ARGUING:

"If the profession decided this was a major priority, that they needed a certain kind of cat, we'd get a lot of good ones. Not fat either."

"They all have psychology in their background?"

"I would be willing to deny what was said on the floor this morning. Our curriculum has certainly changed because of the Institutes. Essentially, we changed our introductory courses -- toward a conceptual framework."

"I hear a blast when people talk, and I just wonder how you turn the screw."

"There's no question that the research door, still, is the acceptable door for most of us."

"You don't want to get your own product back in."

"We should have the availability of usable materials which could be plugged in anywhere along the line."

"If levels don't exist, we shouldn't be talking about plateaus. We should be talking about processes."

"The word 'course' may not represent all we want to say."

THE FINAL REPORT

# of the

GEOGRAPHY GROUP:

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN GEOGRAPHERS

FINAL REPORT OF THE REPRESENTATIVES
OF THE
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN GEOGRAPHERS:

The Geography team has considered a number of major problem areas within the context of its concern for and involvement in the educational enterprise, and has sketched out three major proposed activities (cf. Special Proposals #1, #2 and #3). Major areas covered were:

1. Geographical education, in terms of its research, teacher training, and curricular aspects;

2. "Modernization" of the college and school geography teaching population, within the context of new tool and approaches;

3. Cross- and multidisciplinary activities, especially in curricular terms;

4. Improvement of the quality of college teaching.

The questions and suggestions raised at Asheville will be referred to the Association of American Geographers and the National Council for Geographic Education. Members of the Geography Team convened by CONPASS have undertaken to elaborate these topics and bring them to the appropriate bodies during the course of this summer.

1. To develop a major thrust in geographic education, a research focus for geographical learning must be developed, to accompany and to spur improvements in geography teacher training;

2. Establishment of a Consortium of Geography Departments to train geographic educators at the college level is proposed (cf. Special Proposal #1). The highest manpower priority needs are for geographic educators, and for geographers who will lead the "modernization" movement at teacher training colleges and in the schools.

   a. Geographic educators require dual training in geography and in psychology, philosophy, etc.

   b. "Modernization" leaders require support from educational specialists and should be prepared to go the joint appointment route at universities or the clinical instructor route, between universities and schools.

3. There are too few in the current leadership circle (either geographic educators, or "modernization" leaders). How can the circle be expanded?

    a. Strengthen the structure at a number of university geography departments. Use Consortium as a means of expanding the number of departments, and exchanging models.

    b. Use national curriculum and teacher training projects (HSGP, CCG, COMGA) as training vehicles, developing internship projects around them for doctoral candidates.

    c. Develop an inter-university program for interns in college teaching (start with NDEA, NSF, EPDA fellows).

4. There is inadequate knowledge about the impact of in-service training programs upon geography departments.

    a. Pursue Project Monitor idea for 1970, wherein inter-institutional program monitoring will be carried on.

    b. Need to broaden inventory to include Title VI, Title III and NSF programs.

5. A new coordinative vehicle is needed in the field of geographical education and teacher training.

    a. Special Proposal #2 -- Commission on Geographical Education (COMGED).

6. Future curriculum projects should be related to teacher needs and the teacher training process.

    a. Special Proposal #3 -- the National Task Force approach in World Geography.

    b. Need for focus on problems of the disadvantaged. Call for specific units on Black America and other minority groups (e.g., Migration of the American Negro; Ghettoization of the American Negro).

    c. Need for Bureau of Research to sponsor geography learning research (only two such projects seem to have been funded over a period of several years in the field of geography).

7. Interdisciplinary activities require a new focus.

    a. Exploration of significance of Tri-University, U. of Washington experience in Social Studies may provide new insights.

b. Urge cooperation with NCSS and NASCED in developing certification standards for geography teaching in the schools.

c. Elementary Education Social Studies curriculum efforts need to be inventoried and critically analyzed by teams of scholars, pedagogues, teachers and students. Relationship of modern geographical notions and concepts to framework of available Social Studies materials should be focus for a pilot institute. Initiative could be taken by COMGED.

Three new vehicles are proposed to further geographical education and teacher training. These will coordinate, supplement and expand current efforts in the field. Seed money for COMGED may be requested from CONPASS.

SPECIAL PROPOSAL #1

Consortium of Geography Departments Concerned with Training Geographic Educators at the College Level.

a. Exchange information and ideas about current training programs;

b. Stimulate critical mass of federally-supported fellowships;

c. Exchange faculty fellows, and training and demonstration center situations;

d. Georgia, Chicago, U. of Washington, Iowa, Clark, Minnesota, Southern Illinois, Michigan State, Kansas, and one or two teacher training institutions -- possible founding members;

e. Consortium will have its own executive secretary-editor, located at one of the universities.

SPECIAL PROPOSAL #2

Commission on Geographical Education (COMGED)

a. Advisory to Consortium of College Departments (Special Proposal #1);

b. Advisory to AAG in commenting upon its national curriculum projects and COMGA;

c. Advisory to NCGE in commenting upon its materials development and training efforts;

d. Advisory to American Geographical Society in its educational publication efforts;

e. Advisory to the National Geographic Society in its geographic educational efforts;

f. Commission to be broadly-based, representatives of universities, colleges, schools and community; non-geographers with educational interests and expertize will serve together with geographers;

g. Commission to spend two years developing a long-range plan for geographic education (research, training, curriculum), including assessment of the vehicles for "modernizing" the geographer and for improving the teaching qualifications of college geography teachers;

h. Secretary of Commission to be AAG Education Affairs Officer; professional representatives of other societies to serve as liaison secretaries.

SPECIAL PROPOSAL #3

Curriculum Problems and the Need for a National Task Force to Develop Materials as Part of the Teacher Training Process.

The need for a world geography course or other inputs at the junior high school and high school levels continues to be critical. Rather than adopt a new centralized national curriculum project parallel to the effort of the High School Geography Project (Geography in the Urban Age), we suggest a different strategy. This would center around assembly of a National Task Force of outstanding professional scholars who are concerned with education and who would commit themselves to working directly with geography teachers of a great Inner City (e.g., Chicago) for one year, in a teacher training process out of which the need for materials development would emerge through the direct interaction of teacher and professional scholar. The training process would affect scholar as well as teacher, and would involve teacher trainers and prospective teacher trainers at local universities, too.

Such a Task Force might consist of five individuals with interest in world geography. The Task Force would base itself at a university in the specified city (other higher education institutions in the locality would be called upon to cooperate). The university departments would provide support including teaching and research assistants and pilot materials development. The Task Force would organize itself during the summer, work with all of the school system geography teachers, supervisors, and school board personnel during the academic year; and then help the teachers plan their follow-up activities during the ensuing summer (this latter period would also permit the Task Force to evaluate the directions that need to be taken in world geography course materials development). School system involvement might take on formal Local Educational Agency contractual responsibilities. The university at which the project is based, the cooperating higher education institutions, and the teachers and Local Educational Agency would then agree to pursue an in-service follow-up program for at least one to two years following the Task Force activity. Pre-service training of geography teachers and teacher trainers would be tied directly into the program, responsibility for this resting in the host university, allied universities and the Local Educational Agency.

Initiative for developing the Task Force would be that of the Association of American Geographers, with important operational responsibilities to be subcontracted to the National Council for Geographic Education, the University base and the Local Educational Agency. Replication of the Task Force in three or four major cities in successive years is contemplated. As a result of the process, a major departure in preparation of curricular materials is anticipated, because of the direct linkage to teacher needs and to teacher training.

Presented by:

Saul Cohen -
Chairman, Clark University

Robert Harper -
University of Maryland

Clyde Kohn -
University of Iowa

Fred Lukerman -
University of Minnesota

Salvatore Natoli -
Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, USOE

Warren Nystrom -
  Association of American Geographers

William Pattison -
  University of Chicago

Jewell Phelps -
  George Peabody College

Allen Schmieder -
  Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, USOE

Mary O'Malley -
  Rapporteur

IV ECONOMICS

American Economic Association

Chairman

Bernard Haley

Kenneth Boulding
Moe Frankel
Ben Lewis
Henry Villard
Arthur Welsh
Harold Williamson

Recorder

Gertrude Tait

ECONOMISTS CALCULATING:

"It's like Spenser's procession in that damn poem. All those different animals can't walk at the same speed. It doesn't work out that way."

* * *

"Sure. Our discipline is easier to organize a curriculum for. We're not blaming anybody."

* * *

"The interdisciplinary stuff is where we go now. Like the Industrial Arts people. If we could work it out as well as they have, we'd be in great shape."

* * *

"If gin is ninety-four proof, generically, and vermouth is thirty-four proof, and one ready mix martini is 72.5 and another eighty-two, what is the ratio in each case? You're an economist. You probably wouldn't know this."

* * *

"Hell, yes, I know this."

* * *

THE FINAL REPORT

# of the

ECONOMICS GROUP:

AMERICAN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION

FINAL REPORT OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE AMERICAN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION

Progress to Date

The committee on Economic Education of the American Economic Association and the Joint Council on Economic Education have had an impact on the teaching of economics over a period of about twenty years. What has been accomplished is a matter of record in the report of the Joint Council on Economic Education and in the memorandum prepared for circulation at the present conference.

Discussion in the group accordingly focused on difficulties or defects that continue to be a matter for concern: first, at the precollege level; second, at the undergraduate level in the college or university. It was decided that the problems at the graduate level were sufficiently important and extensive to warrant a separate conference.

Economics and Social Studies at the Precollege Level

The section arrived at the following conclusions:

1. It is our view that economics has a place in the curriculum at both the elementary and the secondary levels. Considerable experimentation has shown that the introduction of simple economic concepts even at the elementary level is quite feasible. There should be continuing effort to develop the early introduction of economic concepts.

2. With particular regard to the place of economics in the secondary curriculum, we strongly endorse the development of an integrated social studies program. At the same time we also favor the current tendency to offer a more specialized economics course at the secondary-school level. To encourage a continuing improvement in the quality of this course, we believe that colleges and universities should experiment with giving advanced standing to students who have had instruction in the subject at the high school level adequate to pass a placement test and to go on with more advanced work in economics at the college or university level.

3. We believe that current graduates of teacher training institutions are in general poorly prepared to teach the economics content of courses offered at the secondary-school level. However, in order to be better informed in this regard and to aid in the current effort of the Association of Organizations for Teacher Education to establish appropriate standards of

certification of teachers of Accreditation of Teacher Education, we recommend:

> That CONPASS or the Office of Education fund a test of proficiency in economics of a selected sample of current graduates of teacher training institutions who have been prepared to teach courses with an economics content at the secondary level.

Fortunately standardized tests of understanding in college economics which could be used for this purpose are already available. The results of the project would also be of benefit to both departments of economics and schools of education in assessing the need for an action program.

In addition we recommend:

> That the American Economic Association give its support to the implementation of the Report and Recommendations of an Advisory Seminar to the California State Department of Education (College Preparation for Teaching Economics) which sets forth appropriate course requirements to be fulfilled in the preparation for teaching economics and social studies at the precollege level. If it is impractical to require specific courses, we recommend that comparable proficiency be determined by acceptable standardized tests.

We recommend to the American Economic Association:

> That it consider affiliation with the Association of Organizations for Teacher Education. In addition we recommend that whatever agency undertakes the project of testing the proficiency in economics of a selected sample of current graduates of teacher training institutions should work with the AOTE or other appropriate organization in the implementation of this project.

4. One of the difficulties in providing an adequate program of courses in economics for prospective teachers of social studies is that, as students, they often major in another subject and may even reach the senior or graduate level without having had any economics. At this stage it may well be inappropriate for them to begin with the freshman or sophomore introductory course. We accordingly recommend:

> That departments of economics recognize their obligation to provide one or more economics courses at the senior or graduate level designed to meet the needs of prospective teachers of social studies at the secondary level.

5. We have taken the initiative in urging the other social sciences to join with us in recommending:

   > That a pilot project be undertaken to test the feasibility of developing an integrated social studies course at the junior or senior level for prospective social studies teachers. It is proposed that CONPASS finance or seek financing for the project. In addition, CONPASS is asked to invite the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education to appoint one or more consultants to assist the proposed committee.

   The proposal for the project arises from the fact that, at the present time, social studies courses (more or less integrated) are commonly offered at the secondary level, and it is our view that social studies teachers are often poorly prepared to offer such courses. The development of an integrated course for the training of prospective social studies teachers at the junior or senior level, we believe, would have the effect of considerably strengthening the quality of teaching of the secondary level course. However, this is an exceedingly difficult undertaking, and thus requires a pilot project in order to determine feasibility.

   In no way, however, should the proposed integrated course be considered as a substitute for a strong program in other undergraduate economics courses and in other disciplines.

6. We recommend:

   > Continued provision of an M. A. program in economics (or economics and economic education) for prospective teachers of economics in the secondary schools and junior colleges. We urge the Office of Education to provide more support than has recently been made available to economics M. A. candidates.

7. Through the auspices of the Joint Council on Economic Education and the Visiting Scientists Program of the American Economic Association useful consultant service has been

provided in recent years to social studies teachers at both the secondary and the junior college level. In some cases individual institutions have taken the responsibility for providing this service. For example, the University of Massachusetts works on a continuing basis with the junior colleges in its area; and Fullerton State College holds regular meetings with representatives of 22 junior colleges in Southern California. We strongly recommend to the economics profession:

> That they continue and strengthen this kind of service. Academic institutions and economics departments should encourage their faculty members to serve as consultants to social studies faculties at the elementary, secondary, and junior college levels.

The Undergraduate Program in Economics

A. The Elementary Course.

Our interest in the elementary course is fundamental to our concern with the training of teachers because this course is basic both to teacher training and to the undergraduate program in economics. Discussions revealed the fact that considerable research and experimentation with regard to the elementary courses is going on at a number of different institutions, as well as under the auspices of the American Economic Association's Committee on Economic Education and the Joint Council on Economic Education. A variety of approaches is being explored. It is important that the AEA Committee and the Joint Council continue to serve as a clearinghouse and as sources of continuing stimulation. The Joint Council on Economic Education in cooperation with the AEA Committee and five selected institutions is in the process of developing five different experimental elementary courses, the experimentation involving both content and methodology. It is anticipated that in due course there will become available the essential materials with regard to these five courses and a report as to the results of the experimentation. We endorse the variety of experimentation under way as likely to lead eventually to the improvement of the teaching of the elementary course. However, if such experimentation is to be of value to the profession at large, it must be carefully controlled and evaluated.

At the present time, there is an inadequate number of the necessary evaluation devices needed to accommodate a wide variety of experimental approaches. Carefully constructed evaluation devices are expensive and lie beyond the competency of the average professor to construct. Yet worthwhile experimentation cannot be conducted without them. Therefore, as an intial step, we recommend:

> That funding be made available to construct a "National Question Bank."

A sufficient number of fully validated questions on economics would be made available through the bank, so that experimenters need only specify the content areas they wish to include in their courses and relative weight attached to each area. A test meeting these requirements, and perhaps others, could then be selected from the bank.

B. The Undergraduate Curriculum.

We recommend:

> That the American Economic Association undertake a review of the undergraduate curriculum in economics with a view to advising its members in colleges and universities with respect to desirable changes to meet current criticisms of present-day students and faculty that in our judgment may well have merit.

Some examples of current criticisms are: that the curriculum is too much concerned with the preparation of prospective graduate students in economics; that it contains considerable overlapping and duplication; that it is not sufficiently oriented to current, pressing, economic and social problems.

Another matter for serious concern is the poor quality of teaching often found at the undergraduate level. We make the following recommendations:

1. In our judgment the time has now come when an alliance and dialogue between those members of departments of economics interested in the improvement of teaching and appropriate members of departments or schools of education who have something to contribute on methodology and learning theory would be highly desirable. This might well be facilitated if a joint appointment could be made in each institution of a professor of economics and education. This faculty member would not only serve as liaison, but might also assume an active role in the department of economics in heading up a program of teacher training for graduate students.

2. We recommend that the new Journal of Economic Education seek to include from time to time useful articles on the learning process for the benefit of economists.

We deplore the fact that graduate schools frequently offer little or no teacher training for their graduate students. We recommend:

> That graduate schools require all candidates for the Ph. D. degree to have at least the equivalent of two quarters of teaching experience before receiving the degree. This experience should be under the supervision of a senior faculty member, and such methods as the use of tape recordings of the student's performance in class, followed by critical analysis by the supervisor, should be employed.

Presented by:

Kenneth Boulding -
University of Colorado

M. L. Frankel -
Joint Council on Economic Education

Bernard Haley -
Stanford University

Merrill F. Hartshorn -
National Council for the Social Studies

Ben Lewis -
Ford Foundation

Henry Villard -
City University of New York

Arthur Welsh -
Joint Council on Economic Education

Harold Williamson -
American Economic Association

Gertrude Tait -
Rapporteur

V HISTORY

American Historical Association

Chairman

Paul Ward

Merle Borrowman
Alan Brownsword
Edward Kranz
Joseph Matthews
Louis Morton
Gordon Turner
Paul Varg
Richard Wilde
Robert S. Zangrando

Recorder

Judy Teachworth

HISTORIANS TAKE A PERSPECTIVE:

"I'm conscious of the enormous contrast between what the MLA did for foreign languages, and also what the MLA did for English. We've not had anything like this."

"Institutional technology? My God, did I say that? I meant instructional technology."

"The student is just stupid. You have been clear."

"We're ahead of the student interest, as a profession."

"They really care about history, these kids do. But they really don't like what they're getting."

"We act like goddam poets."

"Is that bad?"

"The Lawrence Bradford Packard that taught me history is gone and out of date."

"He's gone. We all regret it. But why is he out of date?"

"They had almost no concern for teaching while producing teachers."

"History is a public kind of knowledge, which threatens any private history, any history of one's own church."

"They came up to him and said, 'Stop teaching us about revolutions, and start teaching us how to make revolutions'."

"The federal tap is drying up."

"To the degree that you institutionalize this, you remove the status problem."

"All the white were going to vote for Wallace. They didn't know why. All the blacks were going to vote for Humphrey. They didn't know why. She wanted to break through that."

"We're teaching more history to more students than ever before, with less historical sense than ever before."

"We're not very good experimentalists, nor very good empiricists."

"We are living in a time when we are not successful in conveying historical perspective."

THE FINAL REPORT

# of the

HISTORY GROUP:

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED:

AHA GROUP

1. We view with concern a major contemporary paradox. Never have so many students studied history or so many scholars conducted historical investigations and yet there is absent from current thinking the historical perspective and a sense of history. This situation calls for a re-examination of our methods of teaching, the subjects to which we devote attention, the orientation of our communications, and especially our contribution to the training of teachers.

2. We view as highly desirable the opening of new fields and the establishment of new courses which enable students to view contemporary issues in historical context. Historians have long believed that one indispensable way to understand "current" problems is to study them historically. Courses in Black History, for example, challenge us to see better how teachers of history may add to the understanding of students who feel a deep concern over the questions of race relations, the population problem, and other pressing social issues.

3. We believe adequate training of teachers of history can only be achieved when there is a coordinated effort by the departments of history in the colleges and universities, colleges of education, and the public schools. We likewise believe that the professional growth of teachers after they have entered the profession is essential to the achievement of effective programs of study in the public schools. Therefore, departments of history must encourage attention to methods of instruction and curricula; they must concern themselves more vigorously with the training of future teachers, including the development of closer working relationships with public school teachers who supervise practice teaching, and they must contribute when they can to more effective methods of "in-ser training."

4. We believe that the of of Education has made an important contribution to the development of more effective teaching at all levels. However, the magnitude of the tasks before us call for a prolonged and continuing effort and financial support. Since it is essential that the historical profession help develop improved teacher training programs, work in an imaginative fashion toward the development of new curricula, and make better use of teaching technology, it desperately needs the assistance of the Office of Education.

5. We are resolved to pursue through the discipline and the History Education Project at Indiana University the following questions:

   (a) Is there such a field as history education?

   (b) Should there be a training program at major universities in this field?

   (c) Should departments of history that train a sizeable number of teachers each have on the staff a man in this field?

   (d) Should all who teach history have some experience of examining how people learn?

   (e) If the answer to these questions is in the affirmative, what are the strategies and next steps to carry out what is indicated?

Those present at the meetings and representing the Association were: Paul L. Ward (Chairman), Merle Borrowman, Edward Cranz, Joseph Mathews, Louis Morton, Paul Varg, Richard Wilde, and Robert L. Zangrando. Gordon Turner and Alan Brownsword were in regular attendance; Donald Bigelow and Anna Hyer visited some of the sessions.

Presented by:

Merle Borrowman -
University of Wisconsin

Edward Cranz -
Connecticut College

Joseph Mathews -
Emory University

Louis Morton -
Dartmouth College

Paul Varg -
Michigan State University

Paul Ward -
American Historical Association

Richard Wilde -
California State College at Long Beach

Robet Zangrando -
American Historical Association

Judy Teachworth -
Rapporteur

VI INDUSTRIAL ARTS

American Industrial Arts Association

Co-Chairmen

Howard Decker
Melvin Kranzberg

James Hammond
Rutherford Lockette
Delmar Olson
Willis Ray
Robert Ryan
Earl Weber
Robert Woodward

Recorder

Minnie Warburton

SHOP TALK AND TALK ABOUT TRAGEDY:

"There's a new look in Shop."

"The analysis of artifacts. No more manual training, writ large."

"We must be giving these people something of real value, almost accidentally, thinking we're turning out teacher educators."

"Where would you put me in that sort of classification?"

"I don't know."

"Private persons can buy land, put up sufficient buildings to accommodate the students, keep it for fifteen years, give it to the school -- all cheaper than the state can do it."

"How many credits can I get? You've got to take off this stigma. It's got to be an in-training, growth-type thing for the individual."

"Off the record, I should say ---------- Turn that recorder off."

"Economics has already snuck into industrial arts. Geometry has snuck in. History has snuck in. Organizational behavior. Sociology. All kinds of things have snuck in."

"Gunnar Myrdal told us in 1940, and we did not a cotton picking thing about it. He was back about a year-and-a-half ago, and he says the situation is much worse. Unless we move expeditiously, he fears total collapse of the social order."

"The problem is one of optimization -- of doing well or poorly something which we shouldn't be doing at all."

"In that sense, attitudes are psycho-motor."

"Pierce said it better than Dewey ever did."

"This kinesthetic business did something to the person."

"If you will amend the statement to say that our strengths have been in the affective and psychomotor areas, which have helped young people, I'll agree wholeheartedly."

THE FINAL REPORT

# of the

INDUSTRIAL ARTS GROUP:

AMERICAN INDUSTRIAL ARTS ASSOCIATION

FINAL REPORT OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE AMERICAN INDUSTRIAL ARTS ASSOCIATION

The Objectives of Industrial Arts Education

The objectives of industrial arts are in harmony with the purposes of all education. The major purpose of American education is to enable the citizen to achieve his maximum potential and fullest capabilities in accordance with the tenets of a democratic society, so that he can maintain his rights and fulfill his responsibilities. More specifically, industrial arts contributes to the development of a citizen who is informed about the nature, goals, and functioning of a technological culture.

A Historical Perspective of Industrial Arts as an Educational System

Three thousand years ago, a dichotomy developed between the productive arts and the contemplative arts -- each evolved into an educational system. Industrial arts evolved from an ancient craft tradition of learning which through most of history remained separate from the literary tradition of the scholar. This ancient tradition of strength and vitality placed emphasis on learning by doing and on the empirical approach of problem solving. Industrial arts first found its way into the formal American school system in the late nineteenth century through four programs: (A) a pre-engineering curriculum developed by John Runkle and Calvin Woodward; (B) a crafts revival stimulated by the medieval aestheticism of William Morris, Charles Leland, John Ruskin, and others; (C) the Scandinavian sloyd movement, emphasizing handwork as formative education; and (D) a methodology of the Pierce-James-Dewey school which viewed education as knowledge through experience.

Shortly before World War II, under the impetus of new educational concepts largely developed at Teachers College (Columbia University) by Frederick Bonser, William Warner, and others, the skills emphasis, which had become an end in itself, was advocated solely as a means to enhance the understanding of industrial production. Those programs which retained skills training as an end in itself were largely left to specialized schools and programs in vocational education.

Today, industrial arts involves the study of man and technology interacting with all aspects of his society, including the economic, geographical, mathematical, scientific, and social psychological. Industrial arts now embodies humanistic and social dimensions of man's technical activities and their implications for contemporary American society.

Because of the nature of the subject matter, namely, the technology of the past, present, and future, the student finds the industrial arts curriculum to be perhaps the most relevant of all his studies. At the same time, industrial arts has maintained its pedagogical effectiveness by continuing the tradition of individualized instruction derived from its historic roots in apprenticeship while incorporating the more contemporary educational and industrial techniques of group interaction.

Teacher Preparation in Industrial Arts

Unlike other disciplines, there is no dichotomy between teacher education and higher education in industrial arts; therefore, advanced research and development in industrial arts are quickly incorporated into teacher education programs. The following are examples of some innovative programs which have resulted from research and development in industrial arts education and which have had an impact upon teacher education.

At the elementary school level, there is the "Technology for Children Program," funded by the Ford Foundation, U. S. Office of Education, and the State of New Jersey. Similarly, the Southern Association of Colleges and Universities has sponsored the development of a "Tools Curriculum" for elementary schools. At the secondary school level, many ESEA Title III projects have been initiated. Among the larger curriculum improvement projects in industrial arts funded by USOE Bureau of Research are: (A) the American Industry Project at Stout State University; and (B) the Industrial Arts Curriculum Project at Ohio State University, assisted by the University of Illinois. These efforts and others have and will continue to influence the nature of industrial arts teacher education.

Needs for New Programs

A. The recognition that industrial arts includes the socio-cultural aspects of technology as well as its technical elements has forced industrial arts educators to acquire additional competence in the natural and social sciences and the humanities. With the acceleration of this trend, it becomes increasingly clear that a higher level of expertise is required in the fields of communication skills, economics, engineering, geography, history, management, mathematics, science, and sociology if industrial arts is to provide a more sophisticated understanding of American industrial society. This makes it imperative that studies and programs be initiated which will enlist the cooperation of these disciplines. The involvement of these fields in the analysis of American industrial society will help to bridge the gap between the "Two Cultures" and will enrich the separate fields as well as contribute to the interdisciplinary quality of industrial arts education.

B. The problems facing the twenty-first century will be increasingly complex; their solutions will demand interdisciplinary action. Industrial arts educators can contribute to interdisciplinary teams formed to assist in solving these problems before they overwhelm us.

C. Industrial arts enriches the course materials of other disciplines by reproducing and simulating the artifactual parameter of human development.

D. Industrial arts helps provide a sense of pride and identity to certain alienated groups in American society by demonstrating the contributions of minority groups and neglected cultures to technological development.

E. Industrial arts provides models for a constructive life-style for disadvantaged and deprived segments of the community by bringing the student into live contact with a spectrum of career opportunities in a multifaceted society.

Recommendations

A. The Role of the American Industrial Arts Association.

The American Industrial Arts Association is an active participant in the preservice and continuing education of the industrial arts teacher. The Association and its councils are presently active in the following ways:

1. Accreditation: The Association has an active committee which is drafting accreditation standards for the AACTE-NCATE accreditation group. The report of this conference will be transmitted to the committee.

2. Research: The Association has an active research committee and each issue of its Journal contains a report of significant dissertations in the field. The Association has actively supported the activities of two ERIC centers.

3. Student Involvement: The Association supports active student associations both at the secondary level and at the preservice teacher-education level. Students take an active part in the annual meeting of the Association.

4. Inservice Education: The Association through Appalachian State University has conducted two national leadership development institutes which have directly involved the leadership of each State Association.

5. Interdisciplinary Activities: The Association has consistently fostered an interdisciplinary input into its Journal and its meetings. For example, each issue of The Journal of Industrial Arts Education contains a major article by a specialist in another discipline.

B. Specific Recommendations to the Office of Education.

1. Activities of CONPASS should include frequent meetings to attack problems through interdisciplinary deliberations.

2. In future guidelines, encouragement should be given to cooperative efforts involving colleges and school systems to develop exemplary interdisciplinary programs.

3. USOE should broaden the guidelines to eliminate present restrictions on project format, participant population, and dissemination of materials.

4. In view of the success of the previous institutes, there should be continuation and enlargement of current inservice and summer institutes.

5. Industrial arts can contribute to priority groups, such as the handicapped, delineated in the guidelines. It is recommended that industrial arts be specifically identified in future guidelines.

6. Industrial arts can contribute more effectively to culturally-deprived youth provided industrial arts teachers are given a better understanding of these youths' subcultures. Institutes and programs should be encouraged which give insight into subcultures as well as methods of studying subcultures.

7. Institutes, workshops, and seminars should be funded to familiarize the industrial arts profession with the procedures and products of curriculum development projects and to facilitate local study, implementations, and adaptations of these programs.

Presented by:

Howard S. Decker -
Executive Secretary, American Industrial Arts Association, Washington, D. C. (Co-Chairman, AIAA Participants)

James J. Hammond -
President, State College at Fitchburg, Massachusetts

Melvin Kranzberg -
Professor, Case Institute of Technology, Cleveland, Ohio (Co-Chairman, AIAA Participants)

Rutherford E. Lockette -
Chairman, Department of Industrial Education and Technology, Trenton State College, Trenton, New Jersey

Delmar W. Olson -
Coordinator, Industrial Arts Graduate Studies, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina

Willis E. Ray -
IACP Associate Director, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

Robert D. Ryan -
Chairman, Department of Technology, St. Cloud State College, St. Cloud, Minnesota

Earl M. Weber -
Dean, Graduate Studies, Millersville State College, Millersville, Pennsylvania

Robert L. Woodward -
Consultant, Industrial Arts Education, California State Department of Education, Sacramento, California

Minnie Warburton -
Rapporteur

VII PSYCHOLOGY

American Psychological Association

Chairman

Robert Anderson

Alan Boneau
Walter Crockett
James Laird
Evelyn Perloff
Michael Wertheimer

Recorder

Polly Bartholomew

THE PSYCHOLOGISTS ANALYZE:

"Sounds too much like 'take a teacher to lunch' to me."

"You get very ego-involved, very resistant to evaluation."

"Yes, the study of school boredom would be a good project. Why didn't you bring it up sooner?"

"Of course, you realize the first three letters of apathy are A-P-A."

"The feedback from daily, systematic student evaluation can be quite ruthless, and, I presume, useful."

"Like at ________________. They had that kind of thing. 'His lectures are awful but you don't need to go. Just read his book.' That kind of comment."

"Give every faculty member a video-tape of himself in action. Ouch!"

"I was impressed by Boulding's option. Put economics in the curriculum subversively. Especially, if it isn't a chess game to them yet. We've got to 'psych' them into it."

"If you take Freud out of sociology, or out of the home economics courses -------- "

"At least, those people teaching kindergarten are interested in kids."

"Every bit of that was excised when they went into the revision, and it's never come back into experimental psychology. They stopped being interested in what happens when somebody learns."

THE FINAL REPORT

of the

PSYCHOLOGY GROUP:

AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

FINAL REPORT OF REPRESENTATIVES
OF THE
AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

Little official and systematic has been done by the American Psychological Association as yet with respect to teacher education and curriculum development below the graduate level of training. There have, however, been numerous individual efforts which have offered directions which the profession could take. These efforts have included programs in computerized instruction, programmed learning, and individualized instruction, all of which have not only broadened the scope of the discipline of psychology, but have also contributed substantially to programs designed by the other disciplines and teachers of teachers. There have been additional involvements in educational research training and the development of educational models for other disciplines. Another rapidly changing area of concern deals with the development of instruments and techniques of evaluation, and with the process of evaluating the outcomes of educational projects and programs. Several individually organized summer institutes for teachers of psychology in high schools have also been conducted during the last few years, but these have reached only a few hundred teachers. Two efforts at producing guidelines for curricula at the college level must also be mentioned.

Despite the relative insignificance of this array of accomplishments, compared to the major efforts already undertaken by several disciplinary groups, we sense an increasing concern among psychologists for the process of education. We further sense that our colleagues and the Association which represents them will respond appropriately when confronted both with the important social issues represented in the educational process and with the consequences of ignoring them. The present statement is an attempt to communicate our concerns about issues which have in general been only peripheral to recent main efforts of psychology and psychologists. Additionally, suggestions are made for activities to promote a redirection of the focus of attention toward the problems of education.

The APA representatives must also recognize the many contributions of others attending the conference who participated in group meetings and materially aided us in shaping our thinking. These include Mrs. Ellen Borrowman and APA members Walter Crockett, James Laird, and Evelyn Perloff.

We begin by noting that schools are a central, prime means of acculturation and socialization and that the quality of our life depends almost entirely upon their effectiveness. It is also apparent that this effectiveness must be immediately enhanced, and that, to this end, as citizens and psychologists we must contribute whatever we can. Accordingly,

1. The APA should take official steps to reaffirm its recognition that the role of the teacher is a crucial and significant one in society. These steps should include programmatic efforts to support teacher education and the educational enterprise.

2. The APA should be encouraged to support and lend respectability to a rapprochement between psychology and education. Psychologists must recognize that, for them, the field of education is increasingly important and legitimate as an area of basic interest and applied research. Specifically, psychologists can help by cooperating in the development of better evaluation tools and methods, better research designs in education, and systematic models for the teaching process as well as for the learning process, and by contributing to the understanding of such important processes as motivation, perception, and the like.

3. The APA should develop educational philosophies and goals appropriate to the contributions which potentially can be made by psychology to the educational enterprise and should develop mechanisms which embody these considerations. Psychology has two roles to play in the education process:

    a. In providing a theoretical underpinning to education in general and in offering derived services and resources to educators in the several disciplines and in the schools.

    b. In developing curricula and materials, and managing the teaching of the discipline of psychology at all levels of instruction.

4. Psychologists as teachers must recognize that they are primarily teachers of teachers and other citizens rather than of potential psychology graduate students. Narrow disciplinary emphases should not interfere with providing useful education in psychology to these significant others.

5. As soon as possible, an intensive analysis of the goals and philosophies appropriate to the teaching of psychology at all levels in all contexts must be made and programs of implementation devised. These explorations should be undertaken in consultation and cooperation with other related disciplines, with teachers, and with students.

6. To begin implementation of item (5) above, a meeting of top consultants and leaders in the discipline should be convened as soon as possible to discuss some of the priorities, problems, and potential solutions.

7. The relationship between the U. S. Office of Education and organized psychology should be strengthened.

8. Vehicles for collaboration at all educational levels and for coordination of activities and programs among the behavioral sciences should be initiated.

9. There are many psychologists within the association who have strong backgrounds in other disciplines, who could potentially contribute to the solution of some of the learning problems in those disciplines. Channels for the constructive utilization of their knowledge and skills should be developed.

In order to attain some of the above objectives specifically dealing with the teaching of psychology in the high schools, the following short- and long-range projects should be undertaken by the American Psychological Association. The urgency is obvious. History indicates that the undergraduate curriculum in psychology developed by accident. The same thing is happening in the high schools because there has been little or no help from organized psychology.

1. There is an immediate need to get involved in the preparation of teachers who deal with psychological concepts and in the development of appropriate curricular materials.

    a. Immediate answers are needed for secondary school teachers and others who are requesting guidelines and advice concerning psychological content and methods of presenting it.

    b. There is an immediate need by teacher training institutions for guidelines dealing with the preparation of high school teachers of psychology.

    c. Both of these efforts obviously require long-range follow-up in the form of curriculum development both at the secondary and college level.

2. An immediate inventory should be made of the characteristics of teachers of psychology and of psychology courses in secondary schools. We also need an elaboration on the anticipated demand for teachers of psychology in secondary schools over the next ten years.

3. Because of the quantity of inquiries directed to the APA, it is evident that there is an urgent need to organize a structure which will serve as a clearinghouse and as a means of dissemination of appropriate information.

4. Today, there are some 6,000 high school teachers of psychology. It is projected that within ten years, there will be between 20,000 and 25,000 such teachers in the secondary schools. Unless organized psychology intervenes, very few of these teachers will have received any direct training in the teaching of psychology. A massive effort, directed at preservice and in-service training, will obviously be required.

5. The APA should seek to cooperate with accrediting agencies in establishing guidelines for the teaching and utilization of psychological content and materials.

Presented by:

Robert Anderson -
Chairman, Eastern Michigan University

Alan Boneau -
American Psychological Association

Michael Wertheimer -
University of Colorado

Polly Bartholomew -
Rapporteur

VIII POLITICAL SCIENCE

American Political Science Association

Chairman

Paul Abramson

Russell Farnen
Ted Fleming
Matthew Holden
Howard Mehlinger
Bradbury Seasholes
Richard Tongaber

POLITICAL-SCIENTIFIC SPEECH:

"Okay. 'Individuals should be concerned with pre-collegiate education.' What does that mean: kindergarten, nursery school?"

"Do you realize that out of over ten thousand senior colleges, and over a thousand junior colleges, only a hundred and seventy-five give Ph. D.'s in Political Science? If graduates want to teach in places with graduate schools, they've got damn few places to go. Don't forget, the population is leveling off, too."

"What about a moratorium on new Ph. D. programs?"

"Persons trained at our major research institutions end up in our major research institutions."

"I don't want their ears filled with the sufficiencies or inadequacies of political socialization and research."

"I think that particular phase has crested."

"The jargon has lost its neutrality."

"What we're really going to get is a lot of replication, and not much pay-off."

"As I smell it, I have the feeling that teacher training is going to move in the next ten years out of the hands of deans and professors in schools of education, and into the hands of administrators. If that's true, then you'll be Triple T-ing people who can no longer deliver."

"A subterfuge, to stay within the law. They couldn't directly support teacher training, and they couldn't support teacher-teacher training. They wanted to get at undergraduate teachers, and couldn't do it any other way."

"If you get to trainers of teacher trainers, you're back to the womb."

"Too much short-range planning is on the chicken-soup philosophy: if you've got pneumonia, it won't hurt you."

"It is simply wrong and bad practice to undertake to advise people of whose problems you are not making every effort to gain full cognizance."

"If it's research in a technical sense, you're suggesting ------ no, I don't fly."

"The central city schools. They're scared to death you're going to take over their teaching staffs."

"It's hard enough to get in with a questionnaire."

"Slice the U. S. community in a number of directions and study it."

THE FINAL REPORT

of the

POLITICAL SCIENCE GROUP:

AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

THE NEED FOR CHANGE

American educators face a major crisis. Student discontent is shaking the structure and the established pedagogical certainty of both higher and secondary education. Adverse public reaction to student unrest has weakened the ability of the schools to initiate constructive change.

Inadequate teaching in the social sciences has contributed to student impatience. Students are rebelling against courses that present dry-as-dust descriptions of governmental structures and ignore political conflict. Students want and need to know their rights as citizens. They must be able to understand and manage the problems of rapid social and political change.

Some teachers are courageously struggling to deal with the complex task of educational innovation. But few teachers are prepared to meet this challenge. Political scientists possess knowledge about social change and political conflict, but their knowledge will be used in the schools only if political scientists themselves take a direct interest in educational problems. Yet, the increased professionalization of the academic disciplines discourages scholars from involvement with problems of curriculum development and teacher education. Moreover, the United States Office of Education is currently withdrawing support for programs in which subject-matter specialists train teachers. Our great sense of urgency about these developments leads us to make the following recommendations.

Recommendations to Political Scientists

For over sixty years the political science profession, through the American Political Science Association, has been concerned with improving the quality of teaching. The following recommendations are aimed at translating this interest into practical programs.

1. Supporting Curriculum Development

   The Council of the American Political Science Association should accept the recommendations of the APSA committee on Pre-collegiate Curriculum Development.

2. Improving Teaching

   a. Because we are all teachers of teachers, political scientists should develop special programs designed for future teachers at the elementary, secondary, and collegiate levels.

   b. Political science departments should consider the social utility of new programs. In our view it may be more useful to train teachers for the precollegiate and junior college levels than to create new doctoral programs.

   c. To best train future teachers we must work with colleagues in other disciplines. We must initiate multidisciplinary efforts to train teachers. In particular, we must encourage exchanges of personnel between schools of education and political science departments.

   d. Political science departments should cooperate with schools, school boards, teachers' associations (such as the National Council for the Social Studies), and other organizations to provide better preservice and in-service teacher training.

3. Using Existing Research

   Political scientists should use existing research findings in making recommendations to improve the quality of social science education. Three research areas seem especially promising.

   a. Political socialization research has greatly added to our understanding of the process of learning about politics. This knowledge should be applied in our efforts to reform curricula.

   b. Political scientists are capable of analyzing bureaucratic structures and of estimating the effect of bureaucratic resistance to innovation. Research on administrative behavior may suggest ways in which school officials can more effectively implement change.

   c. Research on the politics of education may increase our understanding of the external demands made upon the school. This research may help teachers and administrators to gain public support for needed innovations.

Other fields of research should also be reviewed with a view toward making policy recommendations. For example, the literature on conflict resolution may offer clues to understanding and regulating conflict within the school.

We are not suggesting that our present knowledge in these fields is adequate, but we urge our colleagues to transfer our often esoteric knowledge into the public domain. Obviously, additional research is needed. One mode of research that might prove especially fruitful would be participant observation within schools.

Recommendations to the United States Office of Education

Some of the present policies of the United States Office of Education are highly commendable. For example, we support its efforts to promote equality of educational opportunity. We believe, however, that the USOE should modify its policies in several areas.

1. Coordinating Teacher Training and Curriculum Development

   Efforts to improve instruction must include a consideration of the competence of the teacher, the content of books and other instructional materials, the abilities of the students, and the environment in which instruction will occur. Innovation will succeed only if all these factors are taken into account. Teacher-training programs should therefore be closely coordinated with the development of new curriculum materials.

2. Using Professionals

   Recent program decisions by the USOE have led many scholars to believe that the Office is de-emphasizing the role of subject-matter specialists in teacher training. We acknowledge that the USOE has sometimes encountered difficulties in using scholars to train teachers. But we believe that subject-matter specialists have a crucial role in teacher training and that these difficulties must be overcome, not merely avoided.

3. Clarifying Goals in Urban Education

   The USOE has properly given priority to problems of urban education and education for the disadvantaged. The USOE should clearly articulate the anticipated outcomes of these programs so that their results may be adequately evaluated.

4. Facing the Problems of Cultural Pluralism

   The USOE is beginning to recognize the culturally pluralistic nature of American society. In order to design, administer, and evaluate programs that will successfully promote cultural diversity, the USOE must recruit men and women from ethnically and racially diverse groups for all levels of employment.

Presented by:

Paul R. Abramson -
Michigan State University

Russell Farnen -
George Peabody College

Theodore Fleming -
Wayne State College

Matthew Holden -
University of Wisconsin

Richard Longaker -
University of California at Los Angeles

Howard Mehlinger -
Indiana University

Bradbury Seasholes -
Tufts University

Earl Baker -
Rapporteur

IX SOCIOLOGY

American Sociological Association

Chairman

Robert C. Angel

John T. Doby
Merrill Hartshorn
Daisy Tagliacozzo

Recorder

Rebecca Ryan

SOCIOLOGISTS ON THEIR SOCIETY:

"Are we an ad-hoc group of sociologists?"

"No, we're not. No, we're ad-hoc representatives of ASA."

"Political socialization in the secondary schools -- they asked them to seance that."

"I am running a survey of the undergraduate curriculum of this whole damn country."

"Remember our notion -- I don't know whether it survived this afternoon's discussions -- that insofar as what gets taught in high school is concerned, we think the teachers themselves are better advisors than either we, as professional sociologists, or the kids; that they are kind of in-between?"

"He's got a sort of superior attitude, 'We're going to get together and decide what these people need.' "

"You're going to get a very high refusal rate from the secondary school systems."

"Why don't we content ourselves with simply a strong recommendation?"

"So far we haven't asked for very much, except for the committee meeting."

"Secondary sociologist teachers? You can't say that."

"Have you considered what sociological research has done to the public school system?

"Serving the ends of sociology, or of public education?"

"Why don't we say that in view of the crisis in our urban schools we urge more research on instructional functioning of school systems?"

"I don't want to be speaking for the economists."

"As I understand it, they will organize the final mosaic."

"They're going to throw the responsibility back in our lap, and ask us to write a proposal."

"In view of the emergency ...."

THE FINAL REPORT

of the

SOCIOLOGY GROUP:

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

FINAL REPORT OF THE REPRESENTATIVES
OF THE
AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

The three representatives of the American Sociological Association at this Consortium Meeting make the following recommendations to the Consortium. The first eight of these recommendations have the American Sociological Association as the ultimate addressee. The last is a recommendation to the Consortium itself.

A. To the Council of the American Sociological Association:

1. In view of the urgent necessity for closer relations between the academic sociologist and the teachers of social studies in the secondary schools, we recommend that the National Council for the Social Studies members teaching sociology be offered an appropriate type of membership in the ASA. The American Political Science Association has such a category of membership to which 10% of the membership belongs;

2. To meet the same need, we recommend that the three committees of ASA most closely involved with the problems of teaching sociology -- the Committee on Standards and Training, the Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum and Teaching, and the Committee on the Teaching of Sociology in Secondary Schools receive adequate support for meetings and other urgent committee functions.

B. To the Section on the Sociology of Education:

3. We recommend that it foster the following three types of research:

   a. Evaluation of the effectiveness of different systems of teacher training in the social studies, both preservice and experienced teacher training programs;

   b. Evaluation of curricular materials and the teaching of sociology in the secondary schools;

   c. With a view to the crisis in education, research on the structure and the functioning of school systems. Among the results of such research might be greater insight into new roles which sociologists might fill in school systems.

C. To the Committee on Standards and Training:

4. In view of the persisting lack of interaction and cooperation between academic sociologists and professors of education, we urge careful study of newly emerging cooperative programs. The collaboration of sociologists and educators is particularly urgent now because the preparation of curricular materials is outdistancing the training of high school teachers.

D. To the Committee on the Teaching of Sociology in High School:

5. We recommend that the Committee investigate patterns of certification of social studies teachers at different role levels in secondary schools and the possibility of a more prominent role for sociologists in certification procedures;

6. We recommend that the supervision of the practice teaching requirement involve participation of both sociologists and professional educators;

7. In view of the urgent need of involving school systems in the training of experienced teachers, we recommend that particular attention be paid to the development of training programs which follow the model of the Triple T Program of the Office of Education and the Cooperative School-College Program of the National Science Foundation.

E. To the Program Committee for the 1970 meeting of ASA:

8. We recommend a joint session with the National Council for the Social Studies on the place of sociology in the secondary school curriculum.

F. To the Consortium itself:

9. That the Consortium recommend to the Office of Education and the National Science Foundation the reconsideration of the current separation between the funding of teacher-training programs and research projects in the hope that more distinguished sociologists would become involved in teacher training if they could obtain simultaneous funding for research relevant to training matters. Such grants would not involve the evaluation of their own training programs.

Presented by:

Robert C. Angell -
Executive Director, Sociological Resources for the Social Studies

John T. Doby -
Chairman, Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum and Teaching

Daisy Tagliacozzo -
Chairman, Committee on Teaching Sociology in Secondary Schools

Rebecca Ryan -
Rapporteur

X ENGLISH

Modern Language Association (English)

Chairman

James Miller

Dan Bernd
Sister Mary Edward Dolan
Wallace Douglas
Robert Hall
Henry Hermanowicz
Alan Hollingsworth

Recorder

Sharon Morrison

PROFESSORS OF ENGLISH SPEAK THE MOTHER TONGUE:

"I know how they would react to Paul's speech."

"Even the decade of change has not changed public schools in this country."

"The shame in education which used to be in rural America is now in the cities."

"You're huffing, over there, I see you. Why?"

"Oh, I suppose I'm huffing at your term, social revolution. After all, it's not even October yet, much less November."

"If I can take a minute, The Basic Studies program under EPDA has only thirteen million dollars, about half of what it cost to raise that submarine in San Francisco Bay."

"How did you get interested in problems of teacher education? You were prepared as a scholar in a discipline."

"I grew up in the thirties -- all kinds of things like that."

"What's happening to English in Detroit may be astounding to us. It's changing very much. The only question here is whether we're going to be part of that change or not."

"New forms that emerge will be revolutionary. We'll either be leaders or observers."

"You're saying that those of us who are saying, 'You gotta get involved. You gotta get involved.' are like Chanticleer. That's very optimistic."

"Everything needs to be changed: graduate, undergraduate, secondary, elementary. Why pick one and start there?"

"We must supply the missing chapter from the Allen book."

"English is at the very heart of the race matter."

"School systems are beginning to operate without us. Thank God they are."

THE FINAL REPORT

of the

ENGLISH GROUP:

MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION

CHANGE IN ENGLISH

I

For a decade most serious discussion of English as a school activity or subject -- whether of the ways of teaching and learning that are appropriate in the English classroom, or of reform in the English curriculum, or of the training or retraining of English teachers -- has been carried on on the basis of the assumptions held and the conclusions advanced by the members of the Basic Issues Conference (1958). But in recent years, for a number of reasons, the prevailing view of English has been seriously challenged, a new view has been demanded, and a new view has been slowly emerging.

Ten years ago it seemed to members of the Basic Issues Conferences that the most important matter was to clarify the real nature of English, to rescue teachers from the confusion of materials and ends within which they were forced to operate, to re-establish English as a discipline fully as intellectual and systematic as, say, algebra or biology. English, it was then said, is language, literature, and composition -- a tripod of sorts, though some may have felt that language in fact subsumed the other two members. Correspondingly, language was defined as the study of grammar(s); literature as the close critical analysis of literary texts; and composition as a combination study, including first, the theory of effective writing as set down in rhetoric (generally of a new rather than an old sort) and, second, of the practice of rhetorical principles in the form of exercise themes. This clarification, it was thought, would make possible a curricular reform that would produce better prepared students for the colleges, and, incidentally, also improve the "non-college-bound."

This "content" curriculum, with its tripartite division into language, literature, and composition; its residual but continuing concern for developing the skills of reading, writing, speaking, and listening; and its focus upon the academically able student provided the impetus to curriculum development in the 1960's. It is now fully challenged.

It has been challenged by the social revolution in America education during the latter half of the 1960's and by such important events as the Dartmouth Seminar of 1966, to name but two of the catalytic forces operative. Now needed and now emerging is a new curriculum, a new sense of the relation of student and teacher in

English. In this new view, the first concern is with the child's ability to use language comfortably and freely. English is less a subject for study than it is an activity, or a set of activities, more or less directed, more or less purposeful -- activities that allow children to explore, to try out, their various uses of language, from the everyday to the artistic, and to grow in and through such explorings, such tryings. Here English is a child reading, writing, talking; responding, expressing, explaining, sorting out; communicating, discovering, thinking. Here English is a new curriculum responsive to children as children (not as incomplete adults), directed to the imagination as well as the intellect, providing occasion for free use of the child's own language as the medium of learning (though not necessarily of instruction), and treating literary works not only as sources of pleasure but also as occasions for exploration of human experiences. Here English is a new teacher aware of the social implications of English as a national language made up of many dialects, aware of and able to cope with the complex teaching of English in all aspects: listening, talking, writing, and reading.

English, in this view, is work organized for truly humane ends: first, achieving the fullest possible growth in the individual child's expressive and imaginative, as well as his intellectual, faculties; second, developing in children the ability and willingness to organize themselves for working together, for carrying on learning cooperatively rather than in rivalry.

Such a view has important implications for all those in the field of English from pre-K - Ph. D. It has immediate and urgent relevance to those planning school programs and those preparing English teachers. Such a view demands a sophisticated and careful response to the dilemma of schools and whole school systems which are under the impression that many of their children cannot read or write. Such a view demands a thoroughly conscious awareness of the social implications of English. Perhaps the profoundest of these implications stems from the deep involvement of a national language in social change and conflict. Such a view implies a new and serious commitment to seeking useful combinations and relationships with other disciplines and areas of learning activity. Such a view demands a sophisticated determination to explore a variety of ways to achieve change.

II

As an immediate step to demonstrate the commitment of the professional associations in English to the improvement of teacher preparation programs, the Association of Departments of English, the MLA, and the NCTE are urged to sponsor a two-day fall conference of the chairmen of English departments and appropriate representatives of the College of Education in the 10 universities preparing the largest number of English teachers for the American public school system. The goals of the conference will be:

1. To give national professional visibility to the urgent need for the improvement of teacher preparation programs in English,
2. To discuss with a limited number of consultants the substance and implications of theoretical statements of key issues in the teaching and learning of English commissioned by the associations,
3. To develop specific strategies for involving community representatives in teacher preparation programs,
4. To recommend specific program changes which can be studied by other departments training substantial numbers of English teachers for the schools,
5. To commit a small number of key professional leaders to the continuing examination and improvement of teacher preparation programs in their own departments, and
6. To provide a cadre of professional leaders who can conduct similar action-oriented conferences throughout the United States in cooperation with the associations.

III

If the English profession is going to respond effectively to the current crisis in education, it must do more than simply call a conference. Fundamental change in the teaching of English, from kindergarten to Ph. D. , is needed, is inevitable, and is already underway. This change is frequently radical, often takes place in an isolated segment of the curriculum, and has profound effects on other levels of the curriculum -- or sometimes renders them irrelevant. The only question for the English profession is whether to resist change doggedly, to observe distantly, or to become involved in order to shape the change as intelligently as possible.

It is therefore recommended that the concerned associations -- MLA, NCTE, IRA, and others -- sponsor and support a joint Commission on Critical Issues in the Teaching of English, pre-K -

Ph. D., made up of distinguished and committed English scholars, teachers, and education specialists. The Director of this Commission should be appointed and supported jointly by the various organizations, should be given some such title as Secretary for Teacher Education of the various organizations, and should devote full time to critical matters of education. This Commission should be given the charge of determining the critical areas where change is most rapidly occurring or most urgently needed, and where appropriate, of persuading the profession to change. Such a Commission might well begin its work with a series of small group meetings devoted individually to some of the most pressing issues (such as racism in the English curriculum, or the failures of an articulated curriculum, or the problems in teaching reading, or the irrelevance in Ph. D. programs).

But the Commission should look forward, after careful preparation, to a comprehensive Conference on Critical Issues in the Teaching of English. This Conference should take as its task a redefinition of the basic issues identified in the 1950's, a reconsideration of the answers, solutions, and programs developed in the 1960's, and recommendations for action and change for the English profession in the 1970's.

After the Conference, the Commission on Critical Issues in the Teaching of English, pre-K - Ph. D., should exploit every means at its command to spread and intensify the impact of its findings and recommendations on the profession, using the resources and conventions of the professional societies, spreading the word through speeches, discussions, debates, and sponsoring one or more publications carefully designed to interest and persuade readers within and without the profession.

IV

The professional associations, in cooperation with a major university committed to teacher education, should seek funding for the establishment of a Teacher-Preparation Resource Center in English, which would:

1. Provide expert assistance to departments considering program changes;

2. Coordinate efforts to inform English departments about model programs, new directions in the teaching of English, etc.;

3. Undertake research into the improvement of teacher preparation programs and coordinate efforts to disseminate the results of such research;

4. Provide fellowship (pre- and postdoctoral) for research into the teaching and learning of English, for experiences in teaching English at various levels, and for curriculum development;

5. Conduct workshops, seminars, etc., for college, university, and school teachers of English;

6. Provide avenues for the involvement of community representatives, textbook representatives, student representatives, representatives of other disciplines and of educators at local, state and national levels in the development of innovative teacher preparation programs in English.

Presented by:

James E. Miller -
Chairman, University of Chicago

Sister Mary Edward Dolan -
Clarke College

Wallace Douglas -
Northwestern University

Leo Fay -
Indiana University

Robert Hogan -
National Council of Teachers of English

Alan Hollingsworth -
Michigan State University

Paul Olson -
University of Nebraska

Michael Shugrue -
Modern Language Association

Sharon Morrison -
Rapporteur

XI FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Modern Language Association (Foreign Languages)

Chairman

F. Andre Pacquette

James E. Alatis
Mildred Boyer
M. Phillip Leamon

Recorder

Inga Savelsburg

FOREIGN SPEECH:

"It might be interesting to the MLA to see the extent to which the traditional image of the language scholar, the literary scholar, and so on, has been readily violated by the very best minds at work in the field."

"Well, Andy, did you come to this meeting thinking that you would leave here with a clear notion of what college teachers could do to produce better French teachers of French, Spanish teachers of Spanish, Portuguese teachers of Portuguese, to nondescript, not yet clearly defined and classified students in the school system?"

"That's part of the hang-up of the people who are pushing you in two different directions."

"What I was saying was that if you bring these people together to talk to one another you'd get a better picture of what the profession might be, and what the duties of an intellectual are, in our kind of society."

"Essentially the MLA Executive Committee is not moveable by Andy going back and saying, 'Gee, wouldn't you like to be different?' "

"Why not a letter to every congressman, 'What teacher made you the decent man you are?' "

"Is the MLA Executive Committee our audience? I thought it was the EPDA."

"I know several Political Scientists who discredited Aristotle's Politics many years ago. They discredited it before they read it, but . . . I mean, I'm confused. The MLA should get involved in politics, or change their politics?"

"You've been more articulate in the last five minutes than in the last two days."

THE FINAL REPORT

# of the

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GROUP:

FOREIGN LANGUAGE SECTION
OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION

FINAL REPORT

OF THE

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GROUP

The Foreign Language Section of the Modern Language Association of America has identified the following personnel training needs:[1]

1. Training of three types of foreign language leaders:
    a. College and university department chairmen (e. g., immediate sponsorship of seminars or workshops for foreign language department chairmen and other selected trainers of foreign language teachers should be established as soon as possible. It is recommended that these be EPDA supported programs.);
    b. Local foreign language supervisors (including school department chairmen);
    c. Methods teachers.
2. Establishment and funding of a program which would extend the concept of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program beyond the master's level and include fellowship support leading to a doctorate along the lines of the Title IV NDEA Fellowship Program, but which would involve a blending of content and method, and cooperation between the disciplines and between schools of education, and between scholars and school teachers, eventually leading to curricular reform and the construction of specialized instructional materials for actual use in the schools.
3. Preparation of a casebook of successful teacher education programs both in the U. S. and in foreign countries.
4. Development of programs in which appropriate training is given for teachers of children whose stronger language is not English.
5. The preparation of teachers for other than middle-class and upper-middle-class schools. (Re-examine what we are doing in larger universities.)
6. Institutional assurance that where foreign language departments offer the "methods" course, the teachers have appropriate specialized training and experience.

---

[1] These recommendations are made without establishment of priorities.

7. Providing of better programs of internship or "breaking-in" of the new teacher.

8. Certification of teachers on the basis of demonstrated competence rather than on the basis of the courses and credit hours only.

9. Development of a special training program to prepare people not certified as language teachers (paraprofessionals) to extend the native-speaker-base of foreign language programs at all levels.

10. Initiation of a comprehensive effort to identify teachers of other subject matter areas who are competent to present instruction in their disciplines through a foreign language, e.g., a teacher of art who could teach art through Italian.

11. Organization of Regional Triple-T Conferences at which representatives from foreign language departments, colleges of education, and the schools discuss common problems regarding the preparation of foreign language teachers. It is suggested that these be supported by EPDA funds.

12. Selection of institutions to carry out studies relating to reformation in their own foreign language teacher education curricula. The object of such self-study would be to analyze the forces of resistance and to build effective strategy for curricular reform.

13. Sponsorship of a project that would explore the existing multimedia materials and proceed to the production of new instructional materials using the newer media.

14. Support of specially designed EPDA institutes for college faculty members; we recommend strongly that plans be instituted for encouraging the establishment of such institutes.

15. The immediate development of guidelines dealing with the preparation of teachers of ESOL at all levels.

16. Organization of a national clearinghouse for the collection and dissemination of information on bilingual education.

17. Preparation of descriptive case studies of foreign language scholars who have successfully combined teaching and scholarship.

18. A study of class, status, and power in the academic disciplines as they affect innovation, program change, teacher education, and materials production in the public schools.

Presented by:

James Alatis -
Georgetown University

Leo Bernardo -
Board of Education, Brooklyn, New York

Mildred Boyer -
University of Texas

Phillip Leamon -
Florida State University

Andre Paquette -
American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages, MLA

Inga Savelsberg -
Rapporteur

XII

AMONG THE DISCIPLINES

XII

INTERDISCIPLINARY GROUP DISCUSSION

SCIENCE - TECHNOLOGY - SOCIETY

Merle Borrowman
Kenneth Chapman
Philip DiLavore
John Doby
Bob Hall
James Hammond
Clarence Hardgrove
Edward Kormondy
Arthur H. Livermore
John Mayor
Robert Ryan
Byron Youtz

Recorder

Minnie Warburton

ACROSS BOUNDARIES:

"As a matter of fact, there is no history of science, done by a good scientist, which is acceptable as history to a good historian; and no history of science, done by historians, which is acceptable to scientists as a history of science."

"I can't believe that fashions in mathematics change without some kinds of sociological pressures."

"This is on top of a lot of series of disillusionment, with scientists, and with the history of science."

"The problem of pollution is a fairly obvious place to start."

"The difference between Galileo and Copernicus is partially between one guy who had the goddam telescope and one who didn't."

"We brought along Watson's Double Helix, which I understand has been controversial as hell."

"Here's a Nobel laureate saying it didn't bother him so much that he couldn't understand the articles in the journal, anymore; but he was really getting bugged because he couldn't understand the damn titles."

"The most dangerous assumption you can make about history is that historical events are valid analogues, which they aren't."

"Sometimes people get the right insights from looking at somewhere near analogues."

"In the 15th, 16th, 17th centuries, the encounter, as colonizers, explorers, of Europeans with very different kinds of human beings, I think we can argue, had a lot to do with the development of the science of biology."

"As Darwin said, 'My God. Can these be men?' "

"There were people who read Darwin, verbose as he was, in his day."

"I'll recommend another book to you: Humanizing the Scientist."

"Look at Marcuse's talk on one dimensional man."

"One dimensional thought."

"If you start out by saying, instead of 'What can we do for them?', 'What can we learn from them?', you may well end up doing more for them."

"Kids of the left tend to be from the humanities. They feel an exclusion from the scientists."

"Pull out the first sixty pages of Conant."

"The interdisciplinary courses we have tried have had personality conflicts, not subject matter conflicts."

"We need multi-disciplinary enterprises like the medical schools, where the engineer goes in with the cardiologist and helps."

"There is no sense of the impress of the societal situation."

"Sometimes I feel the scientists kind of do it to themselves."

Review of Interdisciplinary Discussion (XII)

Informal discussion by an ad hoc group concerned with the interface of science, technology and society confirmed the need for additional dialogue among the various professional associations and the disciplines they represent. In this context, the following recommendation is presented:

RESOLVED: That CONPASS and the scientific association be encouraged to sponsor conferences and other avenues for continuing the dialogue on the relation of science, techology, and society both as a matter of mutual education and especially as it affects curriculum and teacher-training programs at all levels of the educational spectrum.

XIII INTERDISCIPLINARY DISCUSSION

John T. Doby
Nancie Gonzalez
Herbert Hite
Robert S. Zangrando

REMARKS:

"We require each doctoral candidate to have had a year's experience in supervised teaching."

"As long as the departmental chairman will allow the reward system to work in that direction, where every darn thing the man does lets him give up some teaching, then you are doing just what the yakking was about this morning."

"He conceived it as a task, rather than a goal."

"Studies indicate that there isn't even much carry-over from student teaching. They take the model of teachers in the system they join."

Review of Discussion

The group discussed ways to involve the various departments to improve teaching in the schools and universities. One means suggested was to require direct participation of the departments of the disciplines, schools of education, and the field teachers in the supervision of student teachers. Another proposal was to give graduate students an opportunity to acquire exposure to instructional technology by selecting this area as one of their minor fields. Under this plan the graduate would be a professional member of a certain department with an added strength in the teaching of his discipline.

The proposed plan altering the career pattern of the public school teacher was discussed. Under this proposal a teacher could advance to the level of consultant teacher. To obtain this level of certification a teacher would have to have his regular permanent certificate and also demonstrate characteristics of leadership in the schools. Mr. Hite suggested that professional associations could play an important role by approving and influencing this change. In Washington the local education agencies, universities, and professional associations are concerned and involved in this plan.

XIV INTERDISCIPLINARY DISCUSSION

Topic

How can the Deans of Departments of Education
get Together with the Deans of Academic Departments ?

Recorder

Gertrude Tait

REMARKS:

Mr. Settle, of the ACLS, who had asked for the session, reported that he was running a conference to be attended by executive officers of learned societies. Their theme will involve training of teachers. He thought the people in education had been doing more listening than talking and he wanted deans to express opinions on things they would like to have done or not done.

The discussion became very general on what amounted to integrated courses involving most fields. The feeling was expressed that too many disciplines are interested only in what their department should or should not teach, that the curriculum in most fields should be revised with a view to present-day needs; that the chairman of the department of education is the ideal person to coordinate programs; that learned societies should realize that the teacher is not always a liberally-trained person. The trend is that academicians are becoming more interested in teaching. Those that propose changes in the schools should take an active part in the schools.

Somehow the academicians in their preparation of teachers should in the program express:

1. How their discipline can be related to other disciplines;
2. Should be concerned with pedagogy;
3. Should be concerned for common school curriculum;
4. Ought to have some concern for the functions of education as a social institution;
5. The program ought to somehow display a concern of how their field is related to a broader context.

Two dimensions to this problem: thinking about what is appropriate and right in organizing programs and how do you get people to work together.

I was told to say that they did not feel this session needed reporting and that "this discussion does not hang together because the problem doesn't hang together."

XV

INTERDISCIPLINARY GROUP OF SOCIAL SCIENTISTS AND HISTORIANS

Robert C. Angell
Alan Boneau
David W. Crabb
Dick Dershimer
Moe Frankel
Nancie Gonzalez
Bernard Haley
Merrill F. Hartshorn
Matthew Holden, Jr.
Jim Laird
Ben Lewis
Daisy Tagliacozzo
A. W. Vandermeer
Henry H. Villard
Paul L. Ward
Arthur Welsh
Michael Wertheimer
Harold F. Williamson

Recorder

Judy Teachworth

REMARKS:

"I don't think we should be in a rush about this. We should just be in a rush to get started."

"I'm sure there is some common ground somewhere."

"I'm persuaded against my will that this is worth trying."

"In New York City we are making progress backwards very fast. After the first World War the average school teacher taught in the school system for seventeen years. At the present moment, it is five."

"Mr. Hersey is the major recruiter for the system at the present time."

Review of Discussions

The informal meeting of social scientists and historians agreed that, in view of the present extensive employment of social studies courses at the high school level, for the offering of which it is important that the training of social studies teachers should be strengthened, it clearly would be desirable for prospective teachers of these courses to be given an integrated course in social sciences at the junior or senior level in college.

It was also agreed that the development of such an integrated social studies course in the colleges would be an exceedingly difficult project, and that accordingly it would be highly desirable that a test of its feasibility be made.

It is therefore resolved that CONPASS be asked:

1. To finance or to seek financing for a pilot project in the development of such a course.

2. Once financing is available, that CONPASS invite the officers of the American Historical Association, and of each of the social sciences associations, respectively, to appoint two representatives to a proposed Committee on Integrated Social Studies Education (CISSE) to undertake the project, these persons to be selected on the basis of their interest in and ability to participate in the proposed project. In addition, CONPASS is asked to invite the AACTE (American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education) to appoint one or more consultants to assist the proposed Committee.

3. It is urgent that the Committee be convened and proceed with its work as soon as possible.

XVI

RESOLUTIONS PROPOSED AND PASSED
by the
ATTENDING PARTICIPANTS
at the

GROVE PARK INSTITUTE

Plenary Session
June 13, 1969

presented by

Richard Dershimer
Bernard Haley
Merrill F. Hartshorn
Robert F. Hogan
Edward Kormondy

RESOLUTIONS

Never before in the history of American education have the times so required that those who feel a major responsibility for education -- scholars from the disciplines -- face up to this responsibility. Recognition of this role brings with it a willingness to become directly involved in the remaking of the system. For the disciplines to wish to become directly involved means that scholars must rethink their attitudes, behavior, and objectives. Involvement means interaction with all levels of the system; interaction means stimulus to rethink the position of the disciplines with a view toward change at all levels of the system. No other challenge was more clearly expressed or manifestly accepted at the Grove Park Institute.

Our resolve, as organized disciplines, to take part in this change comes at a time when federal practices in educational policy cast doubt on the commitment of the U. S. Office of Education to encourage the disciplines to seek such involvement. We are concerned and distressed at the continued erosion of the fiscal base of those programs which clearly involve improving the subject-matter qualifications of trainers of teachers and of teachers. The Bureau of Educational Personnel Development has abruptly reduced its direct support of those programs best calculated to involve scholars in the teacher-education process. Moreover, EPDA Guidelines, last year, did not encourage the involvement of the disciplines as clearly and unambiguously as did previous program guidelines.

Professional scholarly associations have the responsibility to emphasize the central role and worth of disciplinary and cross-disciplinary thrusts in improving the quality and style of American education. We are deeply concerned that the progress sparked earlier by NDEA-type legislation, which clearly stressed subject matter, has been slowed by most recent USOE program directions.

We are pleased with the various statements, formal and informal, made by representatives of USOE at the Grove Park conference affirming the recognition by the U. S. Office of the central role which content-oriented learning experiences continue to play in USOE teacher-training funding policies. We are only slightly heartened by reassurances that at least indirect aid for basic subjects will be available under other EPDA programs. Two major concerns stand out: that the opportunities for proposals in basic studies under other program titles will not be made sufficiently clear to the professions; and that teams to evaluate proposals under programs other than Basic Studies may not enlist appropriate help from representatives of the disciplines.

While this statement has been framed within the context of educational personnel development policies, equally great concern must be expressed over the limited support of discipline-oriented educational research in USOE Bureau of Research programs. If disciplines and groups of disciplines are to play a leading role in the teacher-training process, then educational research must become a directly related activity. Intervention of the scholarly disciplines in teacher training must be accompanied by research into the educational objectives and implications of such intervention, and direct support of the first set of activities by one area of USOE requires parallel support by a second arm.

Against the background of these principles and concerns, shared by participants at the Grove Park Institute, and in the interest of further involving the disciplines in teacher education (rather than risking further disaffection), the conference participants urge that the U. S. Office of Education reaffirm that level of interest in supporting content-oriented projects that it expressed to the Congress when it supported the more flexible Education Professions Development Act. We ask further that this reaffirmation of interest be operational as well as ideological. To that end, we make the following recommendations:

1. That if the current variety of programs under EPDA is to be continued, a percentage of the funds for other appropriate titles be reserved for programs in the Basic Subjects (e. g., Teacher Corps, TTT, etc.).

2. That means be found to make clear to the disciplines their eligibility for support under programs other than those labeled "Basic Subjects."

3. That the machinery for evaluating proposals include provision for subject-matter specialists to share responsibility for reading proposals submitted under any EPDA program that solicits proposals rooted even partly in basic subjects.

4. That if any reduction is planned for the number of programs under EPDA, the present program of Basic Studies be retained as one of the major components supported by the Act.

5. That a content analysis be made of proposals funded under all EPDA programs during the coming year with a view toward discovering how Basic Subjects fared under other programs.

Aware of their shared responsibility toward strengthened programs in the Basic Subjects, the professional and scholarly organizations represented at the Grove Park Institute commit themselves to the following activities:

1. Finding new ways to inform leaders in the respective disciplines about requirements and opportunities under EPDA programs other than Basic Subjects.
2. Offering assistance in finding and recruiting appropriate specialists to read proposals in programs other than Basic Subjects.
3. Through publications, special conferences, and convention programs, heightening their efforts to encourage new patterns in preservice and in-service education and disseminating information about such programs.

Presented by:

Robert F. Hogan -
National Council of Teachers of English

RESOLUTION PRESENTED BY THE INTERDISCIPLINARY GROUP OF SOCIAL SCIENTISTS AND HISTORIANS

The informal meeting of social scientists and historians agreed that, in view of the present extensive employment of social studies courses at the high school level, for the offering of which it is important that the training of social studies teachers should be strengthened, it clearly would be desirable for prospective teachers of these courses to be given an integrated course in social sciences at the junior or senior level in college, if it should be found to be feasible.

It is therefore resolved that CONPASS be asked:

1. To finance or to seek financing for a pilot project in the development of such a course.

2. To invite the officers of the American Historical Association, and of each of the social science associations, respectively, to appoint two representatives to a proposed committee to undertake the project, these persons to be selected on the basis of their interest in and ability to participate in the proposed project. In addition, CONPASS is asked to invite the AACTE (American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education) to appoint one or more consultants to assist the proposed committee.

3. This group should also be asked to develop whatever other appropriate projects dealing with curriculum development and teacher training emerge from their deliberations.

4. Such a group might well have a continuing existence and act as a clearinghouse for information dealing with the teaching of the several disciplines involved.

5. It is urgent that the comr[illegible]e be convened and proceed with its work as soon as possib[illegible]

Presented by:

Bernard Haley -
Stanford University

Arising from a discussion by some of the representatives from the:

American Anthropology Association (AAA)
American Economic Association (AEA)
American Educational Research Association (AERA)
American Historical Association (AHA)
American Industrial Arts Association (AIAA)
American Political Science Association (APSA)
American Psychological Association (APA)
American Sociological Association (ASA)
Department of Audiovisual Instruction (DAVI)
National Council for Social Studies (NCSS)
United States Office of Education (USOE)

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

Whereas the preparation of teachers in the colleges and universities demands cooperation between scholars in the disciplines and in education, and

Whereas the program for teacher education should have the support and cooperation of the various societies in the scholarly disciplines, and

Whereas the development of programs for teacher education demand cooperative action on the part of all interested parties working in various ways to improve instruction in our elementary and secondary schools through the improvement of both in-service and preservice education of teachers, and

Whereas the teachers themselves constitute a most important ingredient in programs of teacher education,

Therefore be it resolved that in the various endeavors and projects designed to strengthen programs for the education of teachers such efforts should also include the involvement of the non-profit specialized professional associations in education whose membership base is largely those teachers in the classrooms to whom such endeavors are directed. This is a necessary adjunct for a unified effort to achieve the goal for which we are all in agreement.

Presented by:

Merrill F. Hartshorn -
National Council for the Social Studies

Ad Hoc Group on Science Technology Society

Informal discussion by an ad hoc group concerned with the interface of science, technology and society confirmed the need for additional dialogue among the various professional associations and the disciplines they represent. In this context, the following recommendation is presented:

RESOLVED: That CONPASS and the scientific associations be encouraged to sponsor conferences and other avenues for continuing the dialogue on the relation of science, technology, and society both as a matter of mutual education and especially as it affects curriculum and teacher-training programs at all levels of the educational spectrum.

Presented by:

Edward Kormondy -
American Association for the Advancement of Science

Merle Borrowman -
American Historical Association

Ken Chapman -
American Association for the Advancement of Science

John Doby -
American Sociological Association

Bob Hall -
Department of Audiovisual Instruction, NEA

James Hammond -
American Industrial Arts Association

Clarence Hardgrove -
American Association for the Advancement of Science

Philip DiLavore -
American Association for the Advancement of Science

Art Livermore -
  American Association for the Advancement of Science

John Mayor -
  American Association for the Advancement of Science

Robert Ryan -
  American Industrial Arts Association

Byron Youtz -
  American Association for the Advancement of Science

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

Whereas there is a growing number of scholars and researchers from a variety of disciplines and from the educational enterprise concerned with adding to knowledge about vital education issues and problems, and

Whereas these scholars and researchers are in an excellent position to improve the quality of the preparation of teachers, and

Whereas it is important that these scholars maintain close relationships with their colleagues in their specialties and disciplines,

Be it therefore resolved that the participants at The Grove Park Institute sponsored by CONPASS among which are persons from every major social and behavioral science discipline urge those disciplines who have not already done so, to give serious consideration to forming a division or special interest group in education and to take other measures that will give greater visibility and respectability to serious disciplined inquiry in education, including the role of education in society.

Presented by:

Richard Dershimer -
American Educational Research Association